324.3
OK4w

OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY
WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

The person charging this material is responsible for its return on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

University of Illinois Library

MAY -6 1968
MAY 31 1968
MAY -8 1971
APR 23 1974
APR 24 1974
AUG 13 1975
AUG 14 1975
DEC 1 1975
DEC 15 1975
Due 8/9/83
AUG 4 1983
DEC 14 1983
DEC 18 1985
NOV 26 1990
NOV 29 1990
OCT 22 1991
AUG 05 1991
FEB 28 1994
MAR 20 1994

L161— O-1096

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

https://archive.org/details/womanssuffragear00univ

324.3
Ok4w

BULLETIN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

New Series No. 80. University Extension Series No. 17

The University of Oklahoma

Quarterly Bulletin

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Woman's Suffrage

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA
March 1914

The University Bulletin, published by the university, is issued every three months on the fifteenth as follows: March, June, September, and December. Entered at the postoffice at Norman, as second class matter, under act of July 16, 1894.

324.3
O R 4 W

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Resolved: That women should have equal suffrage with men.

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE.

Carrie Chapman Catt, in Forum, June, 1910.

Every reason ever urged for the enfranchisement of men speaks as logically for the enfranchisement of women. Manifestly, if the powers of government are only just when founded upon the "consent of the governed," and this plea gave the vote to men, the powers of the United States government are not just, since they have been derived from the consent of half the governed. Therefore, women are asking the old question with the modern application: How does it happen that men are born to govern, and we to obey? Are men divinely ordained to be perpetual hereditary sovereigns, and women to be hereditary subjects? If this is the order, where is the proof? When, where and to whom, did God or Nature reveal the fact? The only answer ever made to this question is: The revelation is found in the instincts of men and women who shrink in natural righteous horror from a change so fundamental. Alas, since the world began, the ignorant, frightened, "natural instincts" of the masses have held back every step of evolution, and have inaugurated many a bloody "reign of terror." "Natural instincts" have been overturned so often by the progress of civilization, that little respect for such authority remains. In fact the source of opposition to woman suffrage lies in the universal distaste for new things and not in instinct at all. It is merely the time-honored fear, which "makes us rather bear these ills we have, than fly to those we know not of."

The fears of the Czar of Russia, the Sultan of Turkey, the Shah of Persia tell them as certainly that men have no claim to the suffrage, as those of the American legislator tell him women have no political rights. The fears of China forbid a woman to walk on natural feet and the fears of the Turk put his womankind in the harem. The fears of Mrs. Humphrey Ward tell her it is consistent with the natural and divine order of things that women should vote in municipal elections, but contrary to God and Nature for them to vote for members of Parliament. An anti-suffragist not long since made a public plea that the Board

of Education in the City of New York should be elective, and that women as well as men should elect its members; yet her fears told her that the highest order of society would be overturned should the same women vote for Mayor. The American would not hesitate to pronounce the fears of China and Turkey which deny personal liberty to women as expressions of brutal barbarism. The Australian who has yielded to the inevitable, enfranchised women, and recovered from the shock, would declare with a firm conviction that the American who grants the sovereignty of a vote to the immigrants from all quarters of the globe, to Negroes and Indians, and yet denies it to women, is a mere democratic masquerader. Such divergences do not arise from intuition, but from differences in enlightenment.

Under the influence of steady agitation the issue grows simpler every year. Woman suffrage is already an established fact on one fifteenth of the earth's territory; and from Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, Norway, Finland, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, the Isle of Man, Denmark, Iceland, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho comes the same overwhelming testimony. With opportunity to do so, women vote as generally as do men. They vote as independently and as intelligently. They do not neglect their husbands, or children, or homes for politics. They do not become unsexed and poor imitations of men. There is no increase of divorces, no falling off in the number of marriages, or the number of births. No harm in any way has come to women, to men, to children, or to the State, while on the contrary, much positive good has been accomplished.

These objections, answered completely by the results of women suffrage in operation in many lands, were once the chief defenses of those "natural instincts" upon which the opposition is alleged to rest, but are now practically eliminated from the discussion. The controversy has in consequence been reduced to three main points:

1. Women do not want to vote, why thrust the suffrage upon them? The incontrovertible fact is that no class of unenfranchised men in any land ever wanted the ballot in such large proportion to the total number as do women of the United States; nor is there a single instance of a man suffrage movement, so persistent, uncompromising and self-sacrificing as the woman suffrage movement. Sooner or later, just men will answer this excuse for postponing legislative action in the matter by the counter question, why demand of women a test never made of men? Since it is proved that women will vote when

they may, is that not sufficient? The suffrage is permissive, not mandatory; those who want to vote, will do so, while those who do not want to vote, will refrain from so doing. It must be remembered, too, that the same type of women who now protest against the extension of the suffrage, have opposed with equal vigor every step of progress in the woman movement. They pronounced the effort to secure to married women the control of their own property, an insult to men. They united their anathemas to those of the press and pulpit in bitter condemnation of the early women college graduates, women physicians and platform speakers. They have never sought any extension in privileges with one exception. Twice New York anti-suffragists have memorialized the governor of the State to request that women should be appointed to positions upon all public boards possible, as a suitable method of utilizing the wasting talents of women on the one hand, and the assuage the "growing unrest among women" on the other. As these women have availed themselves of all privileges as soon as established, and are now asking for public office, which is commonly regarded as an adjunct of political power, it is safe to assume that they will exercise the suffrage when once it is obtained.

2. The benefits arising from woman suffrage in practice are meager, why not let well enough alone? It is true suffrage has not brought the Millenium. Women vote; they do so not like oracles of infallible wisdom, but like human beings moved by very human motives. The vote in their hands has not made ignorant men intelligent, bad men good, nor eliminated political evils which had developed under man suffrage, as opponents seem to think it should do to justify their enfranchisement. The actual good accomplished by women voters amply warrants the experiment, in the estimate of suffragists, but for the moment, we may grant the claim to the opposition.

Imagine the Shah of Persia making official application to Mr. Taft for proof of the advantages to be gained by the enfranchisement of men. What sort of report would our government present? Naturally, it would politely avoid any statement to the effect that man suffrage had enabled this country to get on comfortably without Shahs or Autocrats, hereditary or otherwise, however delicately it might be stated. What else remains to be said? Such report, if honest, would freely confess that of many men enfranchised surprisingly large numbers do not exercise the privilege of the vote. It must admit that political machines not infrequently override the "will of the people:" that

many men sell their votes, and other men buy them; that the suspicion of bribery rests over the suppression of much legislation and the enactment of other law; that men sometimes buy their way into office, with the expectation that the "steals" will refund to them the price paid; that venality has been known to besmirch the ermine of the judiciary; that graft and corruption all represent something real in American politics. Such report, too, should admit the fact, that many pronounce man suffrage a failure, and government "by the people" a doubtful experiment. On the other hand, the report must show that despite all these flaws in the system, a great nation, respected by all the races of the earth, has been builded and its destinies in the main wisely directed by "the people;" that every period of corruption is followed by protest and a purifying process; that the great indifferent non-voting reserve, largely records its opinion in time of great feeling to the wholesome consternation of the machine; that despite the critical attitude of many toward universal suffrage for men, there is no American who would exchange it for the rule of a Shah, however intelligent, or benevolent he might be. The crowning argument of the report would certainly be an array of evidence to demonstrate the unmeasured educational value the vote has been to the voter. Undoubtedly, it would amplify the declaration of David Starr Jordan: "It is not the mission of democracy to make governments good, but to make men strong. * * * The purpose of self-government is to intensify individual responsibility, to promote attempts at wisdom through which true wisdom may come at last." When such report would be completed, woman suffragists could write a similar one. They could not claim to have built a nation based upon women's votes but they could safely invite comparison between those states, in this and other lands, which are based upon the votes of men and women, and those based upon the votes of men alone, and could rest content in the result. While they could truthfully demonstrate that every practical advantage accruing from man suffrage has been exemplified with equal force in woman suffrage, they could easily prove that women have had no part in the origin or maintenance of the political ills which alone compel the conservatives of other lands to question the wisdom of universal suffrage. They could bring convincing testimony to show that the ballot has been as great an educator for women as men and the fitting climax of both reports would be the statement that the man or woman who votes is a broader and better man or woman, a nobler citizen and a

more intelligent father or mother than he or she who does not. If the Shah proved to be an impartial judge, he would certainly admit that men and women had presented an equal claim to the ballot.

3. Women cannot fight, and therefore must not vote; the ballot is based on the bullet and in the end government is force. This objection is much effected by clergymen and editors whose occupation exempts them from military service, and by writers and scholars whose physical incompetence would excuse them from the draft. It is curious that this objection should be urged against woman suffrage in peaceful America, since willingness and ability to bear arms have never been made a voting qualification for men. In no land is military service a qualification for the vote, while in some lands soldiers and officers are disfranchised while on duty. Finland has but one disfranchised class and that is the army!

The two fundamental laws of nature, self-preservation, and preservation of the species, are as applicable to nations as to individuals or races. To defend the nation against threatening foes is "self-preservation," but such service would be of small avail if the parallel of the perpetuity of the nation was not rendered. Every woman who bears or rears a child; every woman who takes the man's place on the farm, in the factory or shop, is as much a war power, as the man who actually pulls the trigger. There must be production of food and clothes and equipment to maintain the army, and soldiers must be reared to take the place of the fallen, and that service is as imperative to the safety and perpetuity of the nation as is that of the actual fighters.

No contest is permanently settled by the arbitrament of arms, unless "the heavy batallions" happen to be on the side of right. Opponents are fond of putting the question: Suppose all women should vote on one side and all men on the other, and the women should cast the larger vote; would not men compel the women to surrender their views to their greater physical force, and thus defeat the election? If so absurdly impossible a case should rise, this might be the result. So, too, any majority might be forced to yield to the more skillful fighting strength of the minority, even though all were men. Does this prove that the physically weak majority should be disfranchised? A majority group of university men voters might be made to surrender their convictions to a minority group of prize fighters. Does this prove that prize fighters have a clearer right to the

vote? The real question involved in this hypothetical case, is not one of physical difference, but one of right. Did all women vote for the right side of a question, and the men for the wrong side, the women would triumph in the end, no matter whether the extraneous influence of physical force was introduced into the contest, or not. Those who argue upon the supposition that physical force is the real arbiter in a democracy, have lost sight of the finest development of civilization, and that is, that reason invariably forms the final jury before which all causes are tried. They forget, too, that in a Republic every righteous influence is bent toward fostering respect for the "will of the majority," as the real sovereign. A defeated minority does not declare war; it bides its time, educates and agitates, and if it is really right it wins ultimately in a battle of ballots.

The woman suffrage movement meets one powerful obstacle, sex-prejudice. It is difficult to interpret the principle, "God created man free and equal," to mean men and women, but let not Americans forget that women are people, and that in a government which is alleged to derive its just powers from the consent of the governed (people), the ballot may not consistently be withheld from them.

WHY MOST WOMEN DO NOT WANT TO VOTE.

Ann Watkins in The Outlook, May 4, 1912.

There are twenty-four million women in the United States old enough to vote if the law would let them. Two million of these are either fighting for the ballot or standing back and cheering the combatants. What puzzled me was why the twenty-two million do not care a snap about the ballot, despite the furious fight that has been made by the militant among the two million.

I ventured to ask a Suffragist friend of mine the reason. At the first pause in the stump speech provoked by this query I repeated the question. After the third outburst again I gently but firmly repeated the question.

"Women never know what's good for 'em," she said, grimly. "You have to force it upon 'em—cram it down their throats."

Somehow that didn't seem convincing—probably because it isn't true. But if it is true, it seems to me a painfully poor argument for woman suffrage. If we are as unintelligent and helpless as all that, it would mean that if ever we were given the ballot, the two million Suffragists would cram down the throats of the twenty-two million who are just quiet home women what

they thought was good for us. If that condition should ever come about, I hate to imagine what would happen if we—the twenty-two million—really did rebel.

Ever so many people whom I questioned gave me ever so many answers. But none seemed to explain my own position. I simply had to find out for myself.

I read many books and articles and permitted the Suffragist ladies to bombard me with their heaviest weapons. The moot question about which the diligent ones argue so furiously—the right of women to the ballot—didn't bother me at all. I don't see how there can be any dispute about it, considered merely as a right. I know perfectly well I have as much moral right to exercise the suffrage as any male two-legged, unfeathered animal who has reached the age of twenty-one. The conviction that I have a right to vote has no force. I have a right to cut my hair short, to wear trousers and a frock coat, like Dr. Mary Walker. I have a right to spend all my money for tin whistles or balloons or chewing-gum. I have a right to do a thousand things that I never would want to do under any circumstances.

From the books I learned about Lucretia Mott, a simple Quaker maid, not yet out of her teens, who struggled so hard to get the education her fine mind craved, and who found the doors of education barred against her because she was a woman. She had something to fight for and little wonder she put up a good fight for the ballot or anything else which would give her some measure of freedom. I was talking about that to a learned man—a man who is so human that it is almost impossible to believe that he is a doctor of philosophy—and I asked him why she thought the ballot would accomplish her purpose. He smiled and said:

"The ballot is an appeal to force. It was the strongest force the Quaker girl could think of. The ballot never created anything—a reform, an idea, or a law. It simply puts them into effect—enforces them."

Lucretia Mott was more nearly convincing to me than any modern argument, but the smile of the doctor brought to my mind the colleges and technical schools, the co-educational institutions, professional and academic, throughout the land in which education was made as free to women as to men long before any woman was permitted to vote.

When I came to read of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the grand old woman of America, fighting side by side with such men as Wendell Phillips, William Ellery Channing, Horace Greeley,

and Gerrit Smith for abolition, I could understand why she, too, demanded votes for women; but the slaves were freed long before the universal suffrage movement was out of its swaddling-clothes. Susan B. Anthony, fighting against the liquor traffic, was one of the most earnest of the Suffragists; but the ballot has not yet solved the liquor question. And Antoinette Brown, the first woman preacher to graduate from an American college, wanted the suffrage because she believed that only through the power of the vote could women gain a hearing when it came to matters outside of that narrow realm which was contemptuously termed their "sphere."

There were mighty battles in those days, with great issues at stake. The women were engaged in an almost life-and-death struggle—the right to be educated, the right to enter the industrial field as free workers, the right to control their children, the right to control their own property. It was a terribly bitter fight. Scurrilous abuse and vituperation deluged the women who were brave enough to stand up and fight. Their ideas of independence were assailed as revolutionary, and if these ideas went into effect it meant the overturning of the government and society. It wasn't any wonder that women cried for the ballot, because that seemed to them the mightiest force that could be employed to gain their liberty.

But the significant thing is that, with the exception of the ballot, everything for which these noble women fought, and scores of things which they felt were far beyond their reach, have been given them, as one may know by looking at the Women's Declaration of Independence drawn up by Susan B. Anthony. An eminent lawyer who himself has a leaning toward universal suffrage—I know his wife very well—admits that. It was from him that I learned that, under the compelling urge of feminine persuasion and demand, men have enthusiastically gone ahead and made laws which deliver them, bound hand and foot, into the power of women for whose welfare these men are responsible. In New York, for instance (and it is equally true of other progressive states), there are special protective laws that safeguard women more than men. He cites these:

1. A widow is entitled to the use for life of one-third of her husband's real estate, nor can she be deprived of this by will. The wife, on the other hand, may deprive her husband by will of all claim whatsoever to any part or fraction of her estate, real or personal.

2. A woman may sell her real estate or personal property

without her husband's permission. A man since his wife has a prospective claim on one-third of his real estate, cannot dispose of the whole title to his real estate without her consenting to the surrender of her claim.

3. A woman has the right to all of any money she can earn; a man is compelled to maintain properly both his wife and their children.

4. A man is responsible for debts contracted by his wife for necessaries—so considered in accordance with her social position. A woman is not liable for any debts contracted save her own.

5. Provided she secures the divorce, a woman may compel her husband to pay her alimony; a man has no claim whatever upon her property or purse under like conditions.

6. A woman is eligible for any and every profession compatible with her physical make-up, of which she is in almost every instance permitted to be the judge.

The man of the law said that many states are still lagging behind, but they seemed to be coming into line. The old worn-out laws that remain on the statute-books do no more injustice to women than to men. He went on to say that the real test of suffrage—if it were universally adopted—would not come for fifty or a hundred years, as it would take that length of time to change the statute law so that women will be on an exact equality with men, from being eligible to serve as a justice of the supreme court to being compelled to bear the same relations to the support of the family that man does. If she has the ballot, she will not be permitted to waste her husband's property, run him into debt, neglect her home and children, get a divorce whenever she feels like it, and do a hundred other things inimical to him that she now can do with legal impunity.

I was beginning to see a little light, but I wasn't sure whether it was the faint gleam of truth or only a will-o'-the-wisp. I turned to Molly Elliot Seawell, an enthusiastic anti-suffragist, and read:

"One fact is admitted, however, by every person familiar with the rudiments of the common law—that all property privileges must be resigned at once by every woman who acquires a vote. This must be done as a matter not only of justice, but of necessity, for no voter can claim maintenance from another voter who may cast a vote which may not only impair, but even destroy, the power of the first voter to support the second voter. The wife, for example, may be a free-trader and the

husband a protectionist. The wife may, by her single vote, cause tariff changes that would enormously impair the husband's power of supporting her. This impairment may be done in a more direct manner by the wife of an official. She may by her vote reduce his salary or even cause his office to be abolished entirely, thereby leaving him without an income. To say that wives would always vote for their husbands' financial interest is to accuse women of absolute and complete corruption. So it will be seen that, following an unbroken precedent which is founded upon a basic principle, a wife, on acquiring a vote, would have to give up all claim to maintenance upon any one whomsoever, except upon public charity; or she may be compelled, as in Utah, to support her husband."

Arguments about the difficulties of adjusting property interests of the husband and wife, both of whom are voters, and the assertion that the litigation resulting would swamp as many courts as exist in the United States today, were interesting, but did not explain why I did not want the ballot, because I had made up my mind long before I heard of these arguments.

I turned towards the faint gleam of light that came to me before. It wasn't by votes that women won reforms, but by proving to the world the reforms were necessary—by fighting for them in season and out. The light grew brighter. Ideals, agitation, are necessary; the ballot is not. I sought out the philosophy doctor, brimming over with my own cleverness.

"I told you the ballot was only an appeal to force," he said, with his grave smile. "It never created anything."

For some reason there was imprinted on my mind the memory of a sincere effort I once made to get a grasp on politics. I talked and read about tariff revisions, reciprocity, income taxes, inter-state commerce, initiative and referendum, direct primaries, and ever so many things, until my mind was in a perfect jumble. Maybe it was because my own home seemed so much more important and interesting. I am reasonably sure that I could gain at least an intelligent understanding, if not a profound one, of these subjects. But it came upon me that I really did not have to understand them, and, with a sense of profound thankfulness, I realized that I was free to escape from the labyrinth.

The plain truth is that I loathe politics, except, of course, those that have to do with women's clubs, where everything is perfectly plain and straightforward—when you understand how the minds of other women work.

I had expected to be interested, at least to get some entertainment out of it, for I am a tolerably bright woman and usually find an interest if one exists. But the deeper in I got, the more I disliked it—and why shouldn't I? What intricacies of interest and cross-interests it involves; what delicately involved points arise; what compromises are necessary; what wisdom and judgment it demands; and what experience! Experience that, being a woman, God forbid I should ever know!

Suddenly I remembered a conclusion I reached long ago—and now I am going to make a statement that will put the finishing touch to my unpopularity—

A woman has no real sense of democracy. Whew! Watch the fur fly. I'm sorry—but wait—let's see if this isn't so. It seems to be true that social distinctions are maintained chiefly by women or through women. At any rate, women who enjoy what is commonly known as "position" resent any leveling process. Picture, if you can, the scrubwoman and the woman lawyer, the washerwoman and the exclusive society matron, the mill-worker, and the daughter of the mill-owner, meeting on equal terms at the polls! Even in the early days this spirit predominated, and, to quote Ida Tarbell, "many women who have fought for their political rights would not work with Abolitionists and Negro women."

The heights of politics are dizzy ones, but oh, its depths—let me not look into them! It is not necessary; there are the men—the decent men, the good, the high-minded—there are enough of them to save us that. If the ballot were put into our hands, however, they could not save us if they would; and we could not save ourselves. Conditions need bettering, no doubt, but this is not the way to better them, this rushing in and wallowing in mire. Men have done much; I still have faith that they will go on doing, not ceasing until the all has been accomplished.

But, on the other hand, there are things like child labor and tenement-house laws and health regulations; and for a moment or two I wavered—maybe, after all, it was my duty to vote. Then it came upon me that I didn't want to vote for the sake of voting, but I wanted to bring about certain changes. Then there flashed across my mind the solution of the puzzling problem which had troubled me so long. I realized that I did not want the ballot for myself because I did not want to sacrifice my greatest strength merely to exercise a right. A hundred pictures, reasons, explanations, arguments, mixed themselves

up in the most bewildering way. It was much easier to go to the philosophy doctor than to work it out myself. I went at it in a perfectly direct feminine fashion.

"Do you believe in woman's suffrage?" I asked him—I never had before.

"No," he answered, indifferently.

"Neither do I," I said, with great conviction, and I added, with a violent effort to conceal the triumph in my voice, "I know why."

The philosophy doctor smiled politely, without any enthusiasm whatever.

"Are you opposed to suffrage for women?" I pursued.

"Well," he said, "my attitude is like that of nine out of ten men. If women want to vote—that is, if the majority of the women want it—I am willing that they should have it. If they demand it as a right, there is no valid reason for refusing them."

"Why are you opposed to it?"

The philosophy doctor became serious.

"Because I don't want to see women robbed of their greatest power."

At last—the reason sharply defined—it is the real reason why I do not want the ballot. The wise doctor knew it all the time. I asked him why I didn't know from the beginning.

"You simply followed your instinct—your intuition," he said. "Woman's intuition reaches its objective, and at lightning speed, even more unerringly than does man's slow reasoning. Women do not have to grope their way; they do not feel the necessity for explaining each step. They simply know."

"And that is why we who are of the twenty-two millions do not want the ballot. It is because we feel, deep down inside of us, that it will lessen our force for good in the world."

"I think that's the reason," he said, soberly.

I am sure it is. Just as sure as I can be of anything. When it comes to a clash between the sexes, a woman who tries to fight with a man's weapons is almost certain to be defeated, just as a man who fights with a woman's weapons is defeated.

I know my inability to use masculine weapons is a great source of strength. My inability to use a man's weapons gives me a great advantage, and I do not want to lose that advantage. I believe the twenty-two million women feel, as I do, that our greatest strength lies in the accepted fiction of our weakness. The philosophy man told me a long time ago that there is noth-

ing so hard to fight as weakness. There is no weapon that can be successfully used against it. It has either to be destroyed or taken care of, and the plain fact seems to be that we women in America are very admirably taken care of by our men. We can do anything we wish when we can unite on a measure of public concern, just as easily as we can control a man individually, if we care enough about it to be wise. I know it makes the Suffragettes perfectly furious to advance what they are pleased to call the sex argument, but their fury doesn't make it any less true. While the sex question is a factor in the sense that a man, good or bad, always has been and always will be ready to do anything in the world for a woman if he loves her, there is more in the sex question than the ballot. I once heard a great big man who was a power in the land say: "I was brought up to fear God and a clever woman, and my experience has made me more afraid of clever women."

I care more about my home than I do about the interstate commerce law; I care more about my children than I care about mastering the intricacies of the tariff. I feel that the good men—the Golden Rule men—I know are far better equipped to protect me than I am to protect myself through the ballot. You cannot dodge the fact that women have work in the world that men cannot do, and it is equally true that men have work women cannot do. We must help each other.

In considering the relationship between men and women it seems to me not worth while to dwell upon contrasted details, as, for instance, their relative physical strength, their capacity for enduring pain. A man and a woman are so different psychologically, it is foolish to make a comparison. It hasn't any value, anyway. Neither man or woman is superior to the other: the two are just different, positive and negative, two great manifestations of a still greater force. Until the planets stop and go back in their orbits the positive cannot become negative, nor can the negative become positive; and the Great Force cannot manifest itself, cannot do the work of the universe, until the positive and negative become one.

THE INHERENT RIGHT.

George Harvey in North American Review, May, 1910.

The Teacher.

To the ear of recollection sound the objections. Before the vision of mind appear the objectors. Through the mist of studied aloofness they emerge one by one. Behold the venerable

teacher bearing bravely his burden of prejudice. He steps forward. With quavering voice he declares that when women carry muskets and fight for their country, then they can vote, but not until then, unless over his dead body. His say is ended. His legs are feeble. Tottering, he resumes his place. But his blow has been delivered, and he rejoices in the self-satisfaction that it has reached a vital spot. Physical capacity to bear arms the requisite of exercising the franchise. That is the determination, definite and final. Thirty long years ago by his own rule of thumb, his right to vote would have ceased. Under the existing military regulations of the United States, I should have lost mine on the 16th day of last month. By the same prescription three-fourths, at least, of the college professors, teachers, professional men, clergymen, leaders in industry, men of affairs and all others engaged in sedentary occupations would be barred. All who are weak or crippled for whatever reason, feeble in body, however strong in mind, would be disqualified, and the destinies of the nation would be placed confidingly in the strong hands of the prize-fighters, the blacksmiths and the hod-carriers.

The Statesman.

Steps forward a statesman, we need not mention names—any statesman—a diplomat as well: "When all the women want the vote they should have it. When that time comes, I shall support their demand, but I will not force it upon them." A happy suggestion, an easy solution! Fifty years ago there lived statesmen who took the identical position in a case absolutely parallel. Did the slaves want to be freed? No! If an honest poll could have been taken among all the American negroes in 1860, surely not one-third and probably not one-tenth would have made an affirmative declaration. How familiar today would be the assertions that they then would have made! They were sheltered and cared for, as women are now. They did not wish to assume responsibilities, as women shrink from the performance of duties now. They were ignorant, as the most loquacious of women plead ignorance now. Their sphere was the cabin, as it is of women now. They had their lords and masters to do their thinking to guide them, to save their bodies, their souls and their children, as women have now. Such unquestionably would have been the attitude of a vast majority of those American slaves, if the test proposed today could have been made effectually then.

But what of the remaining tenth, whose instincts and aspira-

tions cried out for freedom? Were their hopes and longings to be disregarded because they were in the minority? Was that the position assumed by the American people under the guidance of Abraham Lincoln? To the everlasting glory of this great Republic be it answered, No! There was in the minds of the patriots of that day no thought or suggestion of seeking utterance from the mass of negroes so long as one slave out of millions desired his freedom. Compromise between right and wrong was held to be impossible then. Is it so now? Or are American women beneath the slaves from Africa in the consideration of American men?

The Lady.

Another, a lady, asks: "But surely you do not wish the bad women to have the vote? Why not? Because perchance their sphere is the home? But what do you mean by bad women? And with a gulp she answers, "Why the prostitutes." Oh, yes, the prostitutes! Male or female or both? The bad women only, to be sure. So! And then we are asked to view the picture. How vivid and frightful it is! When we were children at school, we shuddered at graphic descriptions of trips across the Siberian plains. We shivered in anguish at the plight of the wayfarers as they listened dismayed to the howling of wolves coming nearer and nearer, lapping their chops in keen and hungry anticipation of the prey about to fall into their grasp. But pitiful and heartrending as were those scenes portrayed to our imaginations, they were as nothing compared to that which we now hear foretold of what will happen when women get the vote. If we are to believe the reverberations which constantly reach and almost paralyze our senses, a great army of abandoned women, regiments of outcasts, brigades of prostitutes are waiting, waiting only for the word to stream forth like wolves from their lair and rush with frenzied eyes to grasp with eager hands the ballot-box. Truly a dire foreboding!

But has it ever occurred to anybody to inquire what this great army would do when it had achieved its purpose? How would these imagined millions use the ballot? For whom and what would they vote? I ask the lady. Why, for everything that is bad. But how, they being ignorant in common with all women, would they know what was good and what was bad? The answer is as certain as fate. The bad men would tell them. The bad men would tell them. Yes, and make them do it. So in theory, as in practice, wherever equal suffrage has been tried, no "bad woman"—no not one would ever go to the polls at all

unless driven there by a man. Now I am ready to answer the question. Am I willing that prostitutes should have the right to vote? Yes, absolutely and unqualifiedly. As contrasted with the bestial creature, who defames the image in which he was created by trading in human flesh and blood, a thousand times yes. Better that ninety-and-nine depraved women, dragged to the ballot-box by their more depraved master, should vote wrong than that one should be deprived of a single opportunity to vote for the means to save her own poor soul! There never was and never will be a woman in whose breast does not live to her dying day the spark of hope of redemption. I refer you, my lady, to the words of your gentle Christ, spoken to the outcast Mary Magdalene. And I ask all men and all women who take this ignoble position: Why not make the test universal? It is very easy. Let the qualification of voting be, without distinction of sex, observance of the seventh commandment! If vice and virtue are to be recognized as determining factors in the granting of the privilege, surely none can deny the fairness of the proposal. And its adoption would serve more purposes than one. It would eliminate vastly more than the ignorant and vicious vote. It would enhance beyond measure the satisfaction of those who oppose equal suffrage, because, forsooth, they prefer restricted suffrage. There can be no doubt as to what the enforcement of this decree would accomplish. It would, indeed, restrict the suffrage. The only danger is that there might not be a sufficient number of men saved out of the wreck to hold the offices.

The Fair-Minded Man.

Appears the practical man of business, fair-minded, open-minded, professedly broad-minded. Yes, he allows, equal suffrage is right enough theoretically, but how does it work? Has there been any marked improvement where it has been tried? Only facts count with a practical man. And the answer is: Find the facts for yourself. If, as you admit, the proposition is ethically sound, the burden of proof that it is impracticable rests, not upon us, but upon you. We can submit the record of results. We have done so. But in truth the obligation is yours. So we say: Find any nation, state or city where equal suffrage has wrought injury to the common weal, find any nation, state or city wherein repeal of equal suffrage, once adopted, has ever been seriously advocated or even proposed; then and not until then will your question of practicability merit consideration. Meanwhile let becoming stillness control your tongue.

But the ignorant vote? Ah yes, the ignorant vote. Too many have the franchise now. Intelligence should rule. Restricted suffrage is the crying need. A property qualification, too! So! Then why is there no such qualification? Why is there no restriction? You have the power. You have had it for more than a hundred years. Why does that which you regard as the gravest menace continue to exist? Are men unable or unwilling to achieve reform? Look ahead! Is the prospect of the next century a whit more encouraging under the rule of men exclusively? Then why not include the women? Surely this condition, so perilous in your estimation, could be no worse. It might be bettered. In any case clearly, after a hundred years of futile endeavor, this is your only recourse. Why not, then, accept it like—well, like a man?

But women lack practical knowledge. They are idealists. They lack experience. Even those who own property cannot protect it. True, they cannot. Why? Because the corporation withholds the privilege? No. The corporation is more just than the State. More than forty per cent. of the stockholders of the Pennsylvania Railroad are women. They can and do vote for directors of their company. But when State or nation proposes arbitrary rate reductions or excessive taxation that would sweep away the dividends, who decides? Who has the power? Who elect the men who make the laws? Those who own nearly one-half of the great property? Not they! The Huns who work the mines, the Italians who lay the rails, but not the women who own the shares. A property qualification, did you say? Then let the highly honored State emerge from the darkness of shameful discrimination and stand beside the much-derided corporation in the sunlight of justice, fairness and right.

The Home.

But the home! Yes, yes, the sphere, the home, the spherical home, bounded on the north by eating, on the east by sleeping, on the west by praying and on the south by tatting, with the god of petty tyrannies ruling over all. Have you a wife, good man? Does she go to the opera? Stop her. There is danger in the air. She might prefer Wagner while you affect De Koven. She might say so. Heaven forbid, but if not, Heaven pity the dove of domestic felicity! Does she go a-shopping? Bid her cease. She may discover that casting a ballot is no more arduous than "trying on." Does she read the papers and magazines? Burn them. Ideas may enter her head. Does she speak except

when spoken to? Refer her to St. Paul! Does she think she thinks? Scowl! Be shocked! Above all, be firm! Place her hand upon the cradle and bid her rock and be content that now she rules the world.

Oh, for the good old days, those happy days of Athens, when wives were locked in darkened rooms and, gnawing, mumbling, beating their poor wings against their cages, were made to understand that isolation is a duty and virtue is its own enforced reward. There was the acme of pagan felicity, the logical and perfect development of the lauded, spherical, circumscribed Christian home. What matter that Athens sank into degradation and ruin? Was not the wife protected? Was not the woman fed? Saved from contact with the rude, rough world, her femininity preserved, her glorious dependence established by law and custom, all distractions eliminated, freed from all earthly obligations except to fetch imbeciles into the world, so she could and did exist till Death reached out a merciful hand and bid her hence in happy consciousness of woman's functions well performed.

A Lesson in Contradictions.

So much for the reverberations. Now for a lesson in contradictions! A composite photograph of the objectors is hardly attainable. But a composition of the objections may be attempted. These are the ingredients: On the one hand—

Women would forsake their children to vote.

On the other—

They would not vote at all.

And so in pairs—

Their political antagonism to their husbands would destroy the family.

They would vote as their husbands vote.

They already exercise greater power indirectly than they could hope to wield directly.

They are not capable of passing upon public questions.

They now hold a superior position.

They are and should be held subordinate.

They are not equipped to teach.

Their chief duty is to train their children's minds.

They should become experts in governance before seeking the franchise. Under no circumstances should they attempt to deal with political problems.

They are now accorded equal opportunities to earn their

livings. They ought not to compete with men in the rude world of business.

They are not fitted for holding office. They are permitted to serve on school boards.

They should be satisfied with the existing enlightened government. Politics is a mire of corruption.

They are mercenaries. They are visionaries.

They cannot understand or appreciate economics. Their business is to manage the household and safeguard the expenditures.

They would insist upon holding office. They would not assume official responsibilities.

Chivalrous men can be relied upon to protect the interests of women of their own class. Witness the arduous endeavors of sixteen hundred men teachers in this city to obtain "equal pay for equal work" for fifteen thousand women teachers.

They are socialists. They are individualists.

They are too ignorant to vote. They are too wise to want to vote.

And so the wheel goes round and round. Let us pass on.

A Vital Phase.

I come now to a phase of this problem which has not been touched upon in these meetings. And yet, from the view-point of actual accomplishment, it is to my mind the most vital. Grant that men's innate sense of justice may in time impel them to recognize the equal governing rights of all women who own property, pay taxes or earn their own livings. Grant that husbands may accord to the wives of others and even to their own the opportunity to vote if the demand shall become general. Grant that fathers may become glad to bestow upon their educated daughters the advantage of participation in directive governance. Grant that the time may come when the scales will drop from the eyes even of those women who now stand doggedly, obdurately, resentfully, pathetically, between their own sex and its righteous emancipation, not only blinding their own eyes, but shutting out the sunlight of equality and freedom from the eyes of those to whom they should be true and loyal.

Remain inertia, indolence, intolerance, products of bigotry, of dogma, of superstition. Religion is the inspiration and the Church is the guide of civilization. But authority is greedy, and men holding it, frocked or unfrocked, are but human; however firmly pledged to truth, no whit less prone to error. And the multitude, as ever since the world began, from sincerest mo-

tives, find refuge from disquieting Reason in faithful obedience. Allegiance rendered, millions lave their hands and, yawning, turn their heads, conscience free from duty done. Here lies the stumbling-block, here the mighty obstacle which must be removed to clear the path of enlightenment and of progress.

Epistle to the Americans.

To interpret moral and religious law with understanding and due regard for its application to changed conditions, not to misapply monitions meant only for a certain people at a certain time, is the true mission of our spiritual guides. Paul was the greatest of apostles charged with a mighty task which he nobly performed. Would that God would send to us one equally enlightened as of today! Our need is not vain repetition of minute directions to the tribe of Judah or the tribe of Benjamin. Nor can it be satisfied from words addressed to Corinthians or Thessalonians. What we want is an Epistle to Americans, charged with the spirit which made this the land of freedom, which struck off the shackles of the slaves and which some day will enforce recognition of the existence in every human breast of the right of individual liberty subordinate only to conscience and to God.

But "Thus saith the law." Not the law of Nature. No. Before Nature's eyes all stand alike—the multifarious plants, the herbs, the trees, the flowers, the conscienceless animals, male and female, are recipients in equal degree of her beneficent care; of her protection from heat and cold, of safeguarding instinct, of consideration and kindly feeling among men. And even as between humans, Nature draws no line with respect to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. Ability to achieve, capacity to enjoy and inborn desire to do noble deeds are distributed share and share alike. To neither sex is bequeathed even an approximate monopoly of faith, courage, self-sacrifice or any of the virtues which are held in high esteem. We may not deny the perfect fairness of Nature.

Personal Liberty an Inherent Right.

Nor, as we have seen, is there the slightest warrant, even in dogmatic legend, for asserting that, in this most important of all relationships, the law of Good contradicts the law of Nature. Consequently, the law of Nature, which holds all animate things upon an exactly even basis of perfect equality, must stand. From every conceivable view-point woman's right to participate in governance is inherent, and as such pre-eminent, surpassing all minor prerogatives, transcending all other privileges—a truth

as self-evident and as worthy of striving to sustain as is that which constitutes the crux of the American man's Declaration of Independence. Hear what Governor Winthrop said to the Pilgrims:

"There is a liberty of corrupt nature which is inconsistent with authority, impatient of restraint, the enemy of truth and peace, and all the ordinances of God are bent against it. But there is a civil, a moral, a Federal liberty, which consists in every one's enjoying his property and having the benefit of the laws of his country; a liberty of that only which is just and good; for this liberty you are to stand with your lives."

Mark the comprehensiveness of the definition and the sharpness of the distinction. The difference is that which lies between incorrigible error and immutable truth, between love of expediency and fealty to principle, between the power of physical force and the weight of noble example. The task of the Pilgrim ancestors was to clear the ground and sow the seed. That of the Pilgrim descendants is to keep the fields free from tares till they shall become, in the words of the beloved disciple, "white for the harvest," and this can never happen while the land dedicated to universal freedom continues to be ruled by a class whose authority is fixed with the unreasoning certainty of a Brahmin caste by the incident of sex.

AN OPEN LETTER ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Outlook, April 26, 1913.

To the Treasurer of the National American Woman Suffrage Association:

Dear Madam: I have received your appeal for contributions to the funds of the Association.

I was brought up in the camp of woman suffrage. I am a member of the Society of Friends, and so naturally believe in equal opportunity for the sexes in every direction. The Friends, with great advantages to their women, and no less to their men, have preached and practiced this from the time of George Fox, who three centuries ago dismissed the matter in a few words, as a simple axiom. Although in later years I have come to doubt the present expediency of political enfranchisement for my whole sex for exactly the same reasons that I doubt that of universal suffrage in the form in which we have it, I have been inclined to think that, having gone so far, we might as safely, perhaps even more safely, make the experiment complete.

I have not failed to reflect upon the foolishness of my sex,

as displayed in their shoes, in their hats, in their want of pockets, in the daily increasing absurdity of their dress generally—in their card-playing at all hours, in their complete abandonment of all effort to control or train their daughters in mind, in manners, or even in morals—witness the present style of dancing—and the futility of most of the training of private schools for girls. This reflects, of course, the incompetence or indifference of parents generally. I also believe that the high prices now prevailing are largely due to the neglect of the great body of women to study or practice economy, or to teach it to their daughters. Neither in school nor in college do I find that any considerable number of young girls are taught, or required to keep, any kind of accounts. No dressmaker or milliner, of the slightest pretensions to elegance, seems to have encountered the notion of economy, in respect to price, durability, or in any other particular, in her whole experience. Any woman fairly well off, who regards the subject of dress from this point of view, feels that she is very much the exception.

I have been always disposed, however, to excuse much of this feminine incompetence and folly, and the obsession with dress, which seems to become every day more marked among American women of all conditions, on the ground that the foolishness of men has always been largely responsible for that of women, and that if women were given better things to think of they would surely rise to a higher intellectual plane and a lower angle of heel. (I say "rise" for both advisedly.) And I never until lately admitted to myself the possibility of our essential inferiority—such that, in matters of government, we could without outrage be classed with children, with idiots and insane, and with criminals.

But now that I see our own kinswomen across the sea sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind—sowing seeds of lawlessness which we may see in our own day, I greatly fear, blossoming in an anarchism more terrible than anything yet known to history—and when I see our own women protesting feebly or not at all, and even to some extent encouraging, I have not a cent to contribute nor a word of sympathy for any association of women which does not publicly and earnestly protest against such a line of procedure. It resembles the kicking and biting of spoiled children, the raving and gibbering of insane and idiots—and the unbridled license of the most abandoned criminals. All these classes think solely of what they want, and self-constitute themselves arbiters of what they should have. What

it may cost other human beings, innocent though they be, for them to grasp at the objects of their desire by whatever means may come to hand, does not touch their minds; and so it would seem to be with those women of England; and so, also, with those of our own women who condone their offenses—who would condone such action in any cause.

Believe me, Madam, sincerely and respectfully yours,

HELEN MAGILL WHITE.

Ithaca, New York, April 11, 1913.

FAIR PLAY FOR WOMEN.

George William Curtis.

Quoted from Bulletin of the University of Texas.

The woman's rights movement is the simple claim for the same opportunity and liberty that a man has in civilized society shall be extended to the woman who stands at his side—equal or unequal in special powers, but an equal member of society. She must prove her power as he proves his. When Rosa Bonheur paints a vigorous and admirable picture of Normandy horses, she proves that she has a hundred-fold more right to do it than scores of butchers and bunglers in color who wear coats and trousers, and whose right, therefore, nobody questions. When the Misses Blackwell or Miss Zachyzewska or Miss Hunt or Miss Preston or Miss Avery, accomplishing themselves in medicine, with a firm hand and a clear brain, carry the balm of life to suffering men, women and children, it is as much their right to do it—as much their sphere as it is that of any long-haired, sallow, dissipated boy in spectacles who hisses them as they go upon their holy mission.

And so when Joan of Arc follows God and leads the army; when the Maid of Saragosa loads and fires the cannon; when Mrs. Stowe makes her pen the heaven-appealing tongue of an outraged race; when Grace Darling and Ida Lewis, pulling their boats through the pitiless waves, save fellow creatures from drowning; when Mrs. Patten, the captain's wife, at sea—her husband lying helplessly ill in his cabin—puts everybody aside and herself steers the ship to port, do you ask me whether these are not exceptoinal women? I am a man and you are a woman, but Florence Nightengale, demanding supplies for sick soldiers in the Crimea, and when they were delayed by red-tape, ordering a file of soldiers to break down the doors and bring them—which they do, for the brave love bravery—seems to me quite as womanly as the loveliest girl in the land, dancing at the gay-

est ball in a dress of which the embroidery is the pinched lines of starvation in another girl's face, and whose pearls are the tears of despair in her eyes. Jenny Lind enchanting the heart of a nation; Anna Dickinson pleading for the equal liberty of her sex; Lucretia Mott publicly bearing testimony against the sin of slavery, are doing what God, by his great gifts of eloquence and song, appointed them to do. And whatever generous and noble duty, either in a private or a public sphere, God gives any woman the will and the power to do, that, and that only, for her, is feminine.

But have women, then, no sphere as women? Undoubtedly they have, as men have a sphere as men. If a woman is a mother, God gives her certain affections, and cares springing from them which we may be sure she will not forget, and to which, just in the degree that she is a true woman, she will be fondly faithful. We need not think that it will be necessary to fence her in, nor to suppose that she would try to evade these duties and responsibilities if perfect liberty were given her. As Sydney Smith said of education, we need not fear that, if girls study Greek and mathematics, mothers will desert their infants for quadratic equations.

But the sphere of the family is not the sole sphere of either men or women. They are not only parents, they are human beings, with genius, talents, aspirations, ambition. They are also members of the state, and from the very equality of the parental function which perpetuates the state, they are equally interested in its welfare. Has the mother less concern than the father in the laws that regulate the great social temptations which everywhere yawn for their children, or in the general policy of the government which they are summoned to support? Is she less entitled to the fruits of her industry than he, and if it be the best some arrangement be made by law for the common support of the family, is there any just reason why she should not be consulted in making the law as well as he? The woman earns property and owns it. Society taxes her, and tries her, and sends her to the jail or the gallows. Can it be improper that she be tried by her peers, or inexpedient that she have a voice in making the law that taxes her?

It is said that she influences the man now. Very well; do you object to that? And if not, is there any reason why she should not do directly what she does indirectly? If it is proper that her opinion should influence man's vote, is there any good reason why it should not be independently expressed? Or is it

said that she is represented by men? Excuse me; I belong to a country which said with James Otis in the forum and with George Washington in the field that there is no such thing as virtual representation. The guaranty of equal opportunity in modern society is the ballot. It may be a clumsy contrivance, but it is the best we have yet found. In our system a man without a vote is but half a man. When we gave the freedmen their civil rights, we gave them a gun; when we added political equality, we loaded it and made it effective. So long as women are forbidden political equality, the laws and feelings of society will be unjust to them.

The very moment women passed out of the degradation of the Greek household and the contempt of the Roman law, they began their long and slow ascent, through prejudice, sophistry and passion to their perfect equality of choice and opportunity as human beings; and the assertion that when a majority of women ask for equal political rights they will be granted, is a confession that there is no conclusive reason against their sharing them. And if that be so, how can their admission rightfully depend upon the majority? Why should the woman who does not care to vote prevent the voting of her neighbor who does? Why should a hundred girls who are content to be dolls and do what Mrs. Grundy expects prejudice the choice of a single one who wishes to be a woman and do what her conscience requires? You tell me that the great mass of women are uninterested, indifferent, and, upon the whole, hostile to the movement. You say what, of course, you can not know, but even if it were so, what then? They are some of the noblest and best of women both in this country and in England who are not indifferent. They are the women who have thought for themselves upon the subject. The others, the great multitude, are mainly those who have not thought at all, who have acquiesced in the old order, and who have accepted the prejudices of men. Shall their unthinking acquiescence or the intelligent wish of their thoughtful sisters decide the question.

FAILURE OF FINNISH FEMINISM.

Literary Digest, September 7, 1912.

The privilege of voting and eligibility for a seat in Parliament have added little or nothing to the usefulness or happiness of women in Findland, decides Edith Sellers, writing in The Nineteenth Century and After (London). This lady after residing for ten years in Finland settled in her native country,

but recently returned to Helsingfors to find out how universal suffrage and the institution of female M. P.'s worked. She was plainly disappointed. She declares that the section of the Diet which comprises women is of a heterogenous character, and includes those who have lived in domestic service. Indeed, the servants in a house nowadays hold their heads higher than their mistresses, and refuse to cook or serve a dinner if they can get a chance of attending a public meeting for the purpose of either listening or speaking. Politically minded wives and mothers neglect their husbands and their babies, we are told, and this writer quotes the remark of a certain Poor-Law official who exclaimed, "O, if our ladies here would give a little less thought to politics, and a little more thought to the poor!"

In answer to the question "whether the average Finnish woman is better or worse for having a vote," this author appears to think that most women are rather the worse for the possessing of these privileges. She made inquiries among the men and women of Finland, and she remarks:

"According to these men and women—some of them live in towns, others in the country, and they belong to the most diverse categories—since female suffrage came into force a fairly large section of two-dwelling Finnish women have lost considerable in what one might, perhaps, call 'sweet reasonableness.' They are now so keenly alive to their own rights that they are apt to forget that other folk have rights, and that they themselves have duties. They have lost in balance, too; politics are for them now the be-all and end-all of life; they have not a thought in their heads for any other subject, excepting perhaps feminism. They seem never quite happy unless at a public meeting, listening to political discourses, or, better still, delivering them. No political question is too complex for them to deal with in their present frame of mind; they will produce at a moment's notice solutions for problems which have baffled statesmen for years; and will start off on lecturing tours at the slightest provocation. They are much more eager to be out in the world than in their own houses; home-life, indeed, has lost all attraction for them. They would rather work the whole day in an office than spend a couple of hours setting their own houses in order. So some of them go so far as to hold that it better befits them, as full-blown citizens, to issue railway tickets, or sort letters, than to tend their own babies. Babies, indeed, are rather at a discount among them in this our day. The opinion is gaining ground rapidly that, when once they are born, it

is for the state to look after them, not their own mothers. * * * There is no outside work they will not do, and for starvation wages—nay, for no wages at all—eventhough they themselves be half-starved. They are practically never at rest; early and late they are on the go, to the detriment, of course, of their nerves, and through them of their health, and much besides.

"Now, rightly or wrongly, they who talk in this strain hold that the change which has undoubtedly come over many Finnish women since they have had votes is due chiefly, of course not solely, to their having votes. They hold, too, that the change is a change for the worse all round, one fraught with danger to the whole community. And they point to recent Finnish statistics as proof that, in speaking thus, they are speaking advisedly."

The change has been most apparent in the attitude taken by domestic servants, and we read:

"Finnish servant-maids are many of them quite different now from what they were when I first knew them, some ten years ago. The very way they set down their feet is different, the very way they hold their heads. * * *

"Of their mistresses, as a rule, they do not approve, I am inclined to think; and that their mistresses do not approve of them I know. I have heard from mistresses, indeed, such heart-rending stories of all that they have to suffer at the hands of their maids, that the wonder to me is that they have maids—I would send for Chinamen. It is not even a case of all-round equality now, according to them, but rather of the superiority of the servers to the served. * * * A mistress may be left 'to do' for herself for the day together, if any debate of special interest to those who are supposed 'to do' for her is being held in Parliament. Before fixing a day for a friend to pay her a visit she must always take counsel with her cook, lest this visit should clash with some visit the cook intends paying, or some entertainment to which she has arranged to go. Woe betide the lady who, through a mistaken sense of duty, should venture to remonstrate, were her maid, out for the day, to remain out also for the night."

Edith Sellers gives an amusing account of an interview which she had with an intelligent Finnish lady who expressed profound pity and confusion for the condition of women in Eng-

land, and when asked why, the following conversation ensued. The Finnish M. P. replied:

"You must know that you Englishwomen are sorely oppressed," she remarked rather tartly.

"Oppressed by whom?" I inquired, not, as she seemed to think, through sheer perversity, but because I really did not know.

"By men, of course," she retorted indignantly.

"she had, of course," she retorted indignantly.

"She had," she said, "just been reading a terrible account of what Englishwomen have to endure at the hands of men; and she believes it every word."

ONE AND ONE ARE TWO.

Israel Zangwill, quoted from "The Case for Woman Suffrage."

The proposition that we are here to maintain is so simple, so clear, that when one is called upon to justify it, one scarcely knows what to say. The fact is, it is not our business to justify it; the onus of proof lies on the other side. How do they justify their monstrous proposition that one-half of the human race shall have no political rights?

When Wilberforce started his campaign against slavery, it was scarcely Wilberforce's business to defend the proposition that no man has the right to make a chattel of another. The burden of proof lay on the slave-holder. How dared he violate elemental human rights? We, too, appear here not as defendants but as plaintiffs; not to beg and protest, but to demand and denounce. We accuse! We accuse the opposition of barbarism and injustice. We call upon Parliament to redress this historic wrong.

Our case, I say, is so simple, that it is like having to prove that one and one are two. Indeed, this is precisely what the opposition denies. It says that one and one are not two; that in politics one man and one woman are only one, and man is that one. Savages are notoriously bad at arithmetic, but in the battle of civilization it is written that one man and one woman are two persons. Like most simple truths, this axiom of spiritual arithmetic has taken the human race a long time to arrive at; but, thank Heaven, we are there at last! Woman is a separate and individual personality; a human soul, and, what is more to the point, a tax-payer. Even marriage cannot extinguish her. She is no longer a mere appendage to her lord, united and fused, like Campbell with Bannerman. The Married Woman's Prop-

erty Act gives her the right to her separate property; with property goes taxation, and with taxation must and shall go representation.

What are the reasons for refusing this representation, for depriving half the qualified population of political power? Is this half, then, exactly the same as the other half, so that the other half sufficiently represents it? Quite the contrary. Woman has a peculiar relation to a number of problems; her standpoint, her interests, differ vastly from man's. How dare we then leave her out of the reckoning? Take only the last great political measure with which the male half of the population has been grappling, and which they have discussed with such masculine balance, such freedom from hysteria—I need hardly say I mean the Education Bill. If ever there was a subject on which woman had a right to vote, it was surely this. You all know what happened to that Bill—what was the result of all those months of sane masculinity, all those torrents of temperate talk in both Houses of Parliament. Nothing; absolutely nothing. If anything could show the utter unfitness of men for public life, it was surely this mammoth fiasco, this monumental example of male mismanagement.

Yet I have nowhere seen the suggestion that the sex should be disfranchised. On the contrary, it is felt that the masculine method of how not to do it is so marvellous, and the world we see around us so satisfactory, that the feminine touch might jar all this exquisite machinery, upset all this wonderfully happy world. And yet an unprejudiced observer might well conclude that our Constitution would work not only better but with a fairer balance of powers, if the House of Lords were replaced by a House of Ladies. The Commons, having settled affairs from the man's point of view, might more justly have their ideas revised by an elective Chamber of the other sex than by a mere irresponsible body with the same masculine prejudices in an even crustier form.

What is it that prevents a bringing of a bill for Woman Suffrage at once, in Parliament. He is in favor of it himself, and so is the majority of the House. The bulk of the representatives of the people are pledged to it. Here, then, is a measure which both parties deem necessary. A sensible woman would think that the first thing a Parliament would do would be to pass those measures about which both parties agree. Simple female! That is not man's way. That is not politics. What is wanted in Parliament is measures about which both parties dis-

agree, and which, in consequence, can never be passed at all. I declare I know nothing outside Swift or W. S. Gilbert to equal the present situation of Woman's Suffrage.

In "Gulliver's Travels," in the school of political projectors, in the island of Laputa, there is a most ingenious doctor who directs that every senator in the great council of a nation, after he has delivered his opinion and argued in favor of it, shall be obliged to give his vote directly contrary. Really there is something of this spirit in the present House of Commons as regards Woman Suffrage. Perhaps a little analysis will enable us to understand this paradoxical situation. The majority have promised to vote for Women's Suffrage. But whom have they promised? Women. And women have no votes. Therefore the M. P.'s do not take them seriously. You see the vicious circle. In order for women to get votes they must have votes already. And so the men will bemock and befool them from session to session. Who can wonder if, tired of these gay deceivers, they begin to take the law into their own hands? Public opinion—I warn the Government—public opinion is with the women.

It is true that there is still a certain opposition in the country to Woman Suffrage, but how faint, how half-hearted, compared with that ancient opposition to woman's higher education or to her wider sphere of work. It is the last sullen struggle to keep her exclusively a domestic animal. But the gibes and sneers are a mere feeble echo from the past. The fact is that woman's battle is practically won. Today when woman has done so brilliantly in medicine, in mathematics, in science, when a woman has made the most interesting discovery of our day—radium—the stale old flouts and jeers go off like mouldly Christmas crackers. The battle is won, I say, and it is time the enemy accepted their defeat. The vote will be the legitimate reward of woman's proved capacity in almost every sphere of work.

The legitimate but, mark you, not the logical reward. Our domestic grandmothers had as much right to a vote as our scientific sisters.

To have an opinion upon politics is not incompatible with strictest domesticity, knitting not excluded. Nay, knitting her husband's socks gives women the very leisure for forming wise political opinions. There is nothing essentially womanly in being ignorant and careless of the affairs of one's country. Our late Queen, who had no little to do with the affairs of her country, was a peculiarly domestic woman: indeed, quite early-

Victorian. We demand this vote for woman not because of her manly capacities, but because of her womanly capacities. To mix up this question, therefore, with the question of keeping woman domestic is really a vulgar confusion. The most domestic of women may surely be allowed to leave the hearth once every four years or so, to record her vote. Her husband can even be in attendance, since he has to record his vote too. It is really less dangerous than her visits to the dentist.

But it is said this will lead to domestic quarrels. As if a couple who wish to quarrel had any need of politics. Think of the centuries in which domestic discord has got along without Woman Suffrage! As a matter of fact, husband and wife are generally of the same politics, and when they are not, the possession of a vote by the wife would rather promote harmony than discord. The husband would not be left with the last word—the battle would be drawn.

But the bitterest enemy of woman is not man—it is woman, alas. A number of ladies declare they do not want the vote. Poor things! There are ladies in China who are content to have their toes crippled. There are ladies in Turkey who are satisfied with a quarter of a husband, or even an nth share of a husband. But this would not justify these Chinese and Turkish ladies in keeping back their sisters who had evolved higher—who wanted a natural foot or a whole husband apiece. Besides, the vote is not compulsory. Those ladies who do not wish to exercise their right will have full liberty to stop at home, knitting, or read **The Lady.** No band of janizaries will drag them to the polling booth; and even if they were dragged there, the ballot is secret. There is always one last resource—they can spoil their voting papers.

But there is another class of ladies, who, while desiring the suffrage, objects to the present methods as unwomanly. They are unwomanly—and therein consists the martyrdom of the pioneers. They have to lower themselves to the manners of men; they had to be unwomanly in order to promote the cause of womanhood. They have to do the dirty work. Let those lady Suffragists who sit by their cosy firesides at least give them admiration and encouragement. And undoubtedly the best means are not the most ladylike. Ladylike means are all well if you are dealing with gentlemen; but you are dealing with politicians. Hitherto I have kept away from political platforms; this is my maiden speech. But twenty years ago I used this very subject as the backbone of a political satire. Twenty

years ago—twenty years of ladylike methods—and how much further have they brought us? Was there the faintest progress till the other day, when a married lady went to prison to prove that she was not the same person as her husband? In that old novel of mine, Woman Suffrage was passed by the Conservative Party. The prophecy has not yet been fulfilled. But I warn Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman that, unless he hurries up, my words will come true. Possibly even the House of Lords will initiate the measure as a last act of spite against Sir Henry before he abolishes it.

It is true those unladylike methods are not the only new ones which might be brought into play. The fault of the old methods was not that they were ladylike but that they were unpolitical. They exercised no pressure upon the Government. In politics only force counts. But how is a discredited minority to exercise force? The late Mr. Parnell supplied the answer. The minority must stand between the two parties, throwing its weight into either scale as opportunity offers. But does our movement possess a Parnell? Apparently, yes. The tactics which I heard the late Miss Billington expound were those of a Parnell in petticoats. But, alas! the task is far harder than that of the great Irish leader. He, at least, was inside the House, he and his men. The ladies are outside—with policemen in between. What possible influence can they exert on the divisions? It would appear that we are face to face with the old dilemma. To get a vote woman must already have one. But there is a little loophole. Every now and then the party in power has to venture outside its citadel to contest a by-election. The ladies are waiting. The constituency becomes the arena of battle, and every Government candidate, whether he is for Woman Suffrage or not, is opposed tooth and nail. For every Government—Liberal or Conservative—that refuses to grant Woman Suffrage is ipso facto the enemy. The cause is to be greater than mere party. Damage the Government—that is the whole secret.

Are these tactics sound? In my opinion absolutely so. They are not only ladylike, they are constitutional. They are the only legitimate way in which woman can bring direct political pressure upon the Government. Serious as may be the questions which divide the parties, woman is justified in thinking that there is none so serious as her own exclusion from a voice in any of them. And so I would venture to advise those ladies who meditate martyrdom to choose a male victim instead. For

better than to put yourself in prison is to keep a man out of Parliament. It may be said women ought to oppose only those candidates who are against Woman Suffrage. But they are so difficult to find. There never was a cause with so many champions. Why, there are elections in which both candidates swear devotion, and what is poor woman to do then? No, let her remorselessly pursue the Government; there will be at least this advantage, that the candidate, having nothing to gain by declaring himself in favor of Women's Suffrage, will be reduced to telling the truth. Then we shall know where we really are. Open foes are better than false friends.

But although these tactics are sound, I trust women will not have to fight every inch of her way. I trust that man's chivalry and justice, which have awakened in New Zealand, Finland and other outlandish places, will not much longer lie dormant in the so-called centres of civilization, and that, hand in hand, man and woman will try to work out the problems of the social order. There is no problem upon which an intelligent woman cannot throw some new light, and in neglecting woman's help, men are not merely blundering in what they do do, but blundering still more badly in what they do not do, in the terribly important provinces of life which they leave untouched by legislation. We men require this Reform as much for our own sakes as for women's sakes.

Ladies and gentlemen, strong as the Women's Suffrage Party is in brilliant women of our London world, its life-sap comes, I venture to think, from where so much of the energy, the wisdom and the earnestness of England reside—from the Provinces. Were it only a metropolitan exotic, a society luxury, it would soon pine away. But its roots go deep into our national soil, and draw their sustenance and vitality from all those myriads of obscure underground working women. These working women are not womanly, they are not domestic. True, they still weave and spin for man, but no longer for their own hearths. They must leave their homes and their babes to become machines in a world of machinery. And we men, we hypocrites, who prate so much of womanliness and domesticity, what care have we had for these? No vote can make them so unwomanly as not having a vote has made them. Perhaps, on the contrary, the vote may be the only means of bringing them back to womanliness. For only since the working men in these dismal towns have had a vote has their lot become at all human. What Christianity cannot do, what charity cannot do, what

all the thunder of your Carlyles and your Ruskins cannot do, a simple vote does. And so to these myriads of tired women who rise in the raw dawn and troop to their cheerless factories, and who, when the twilight falls, return not to rest but to the labors of a squalid household, to these the thought of Women's Suffrage, which comes as a sneer to the man about town, comes as a hope and a prayer. Who dares leave that hope unilluminated, that prayer unanswered? Surely not the most powerful Liberal Government of our generation, supported by the most powerful labor party of any generation. That would be too cruel an irony, too bitter a disillusionment.

For fifty years now woman has stood crying: "I stand for justice—answer, shall I have it?" And the answer has been a mocking "no," or a still more mocking "yes." Today she calls upon Parliament to have done with this flabby friendliness, this policy of endless evasion. Today she cries: "I fight for justice, and I answer that I shall have it."

A POLL OF WOMEN ON THE SUFFRAGE.

The Outlook, June 17, 1913.

It is easy to get opinions about woman suffrage; it is hard to get facts. It is hard, for instance, to ascertain the proportion of women who really wish to vote. Do the majority of women want the ballot? Opinions on that differ; but on this subject an opinion is of little worth compared to the fact. The New York "Evening Sun" has tried in a limited field to get some light on that fact by making a poll of women in various sections of New York. The result, though of course not decisive, is interesting and significant. In the course of the canvass thirteen sections, representing the widest differences in social surroundings, were visited. In addition a poll was taken among four classes of women—school teachers, factory employees, stenographers and bookkeepers, and saleswomen. The poll was taken at random. Two thousand answers were received. Of these 571 were in favor of suffrage, 651 against, and 778 indifferent. This means that 28½ per cent. was in favor of suffrage, 32½ per cent. against it, and 39 per cent. indifferent; or, to state it otherwise, more than a third were indifferent to woman suffrage, almost a third were against it, and considerably less than a third were in favor of it. In only three out of the thirteen sections those who favored suffrage outnumbered those who were indifferent to it as well as those who were against it. On the other hand, there were only three districts in which those

who were actively opposed to woman suffrage outnumbered those who were indifferent as well as those who were in favor of it. In seven districts those who were indifferent were in the plurality. It is interesting to note, first, that in those quarters in which life is more comfortable and the surroundings more commodious there was less proportionate vote for woman suffrage than in the more crowded quarters. In the lower East Side tenement district and in the Brooklyn tenement district there was the least indifference to the question, though in the one case the pro-suffrage outnumbered the anti-suffrage twenty-seven to fifteen. In the Williamsburg district, which was carried by a clear majority for suffrage, there was but one anti-suffrage vote, but the indifferent vote was two-thirds of the suffrage vote. Among the school teachers the vote for outnumbered the vote against, but this was in turn outnumbered by the indifferent. Among the saleswomen the vote against outnumbered the vote for, four to one, but was again in turn outnumbered by the indifferent vote. Among the stenographers and bookkeepers and among the factory employees the pro-suffragists were in the plurality but not in a majority, being greatly outnumbered by the total of those who were either indifferent to or against the suffrage.

Some Opinions.

The remarks of the women interviewed in the course of this poll on woman suffrage were interesting. They range from hearty expressions of approval to vigorous expressions of dissent. Expressions such as the following seem typical:

I voted for six years in Colorado and could not see that it made much difference, though I shall be ready for the vote when it comes.

Women ought to get all they can, but I have not time to vote myself.

If they want to vote, let them, but I don't care one way or the other.

I wouldn't mind having the vote, but I certainly will not go out and parade for it.

Though I might vote if I could, I feel that I have enough trouble without trying to run the politics of the country.

The strong expressions of opinion in favor of suffrage seemed to be few. Among them are the following:

I am in favor of the movement, but not a suffragette.

I believe that women owning property and working women in general should vote.

Should women have the right to vote? Yes; why shouldn't they?

It might help to make things easier for us.

If anything is coming to us, we want it.

We couldn't make a worse mess of it than the men, and we might do better.

The opposition was expressed in the strongest terms of all:

I am utterly disgusted with the tactics of those promoting the movement.

I have enough rights now and would not vote if I could.

I am suffering enough now and am really too busy to bother with the suffrage movement at all.

No time for that; I have plenty of other work.

It is not a woman's business to do a man out of a job. Her place is at home.

I am afraid to say what I think of the suffrage movement. My opposition is so decided.

To these opinions of women on women's rights we add but one more—our own on men's rights. That is a matter which in the discussion of woman suffrage seems to be generally ignored. Where woman suffrage does not now exist it can be adopted only by the vote of men. The men have a right to learn what the women wish. If the men were allowed to speak, they might well say, "We may decide to give the women the vote only in case they want it; or we may decide to impose upon women the vote whether they want it or not; but we—the men—have a right to know whether the women want it or not, so that we may know which of these two things we are asked to do." What the New York "Evening Sun" has tried to ascertain informally by means of a "straw vote" ought to be ascertained officially by the secret and formal vote of women wherever the voters are called upon to pass on the question of woman suffrage.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE IMPORTANT?

Max Eastman, Quoted from Bulletin of University of Texas.

With the advance of industrial art the work of women has gone from the house to the factory and market. Women have followed it there, and there they must do it until this civilization perishes. In 1900, approximately one woman in every five in the United States was engaged in gainful employment, and the number was increasing. Most of these women have no choice as to whether they will work or not, and many of them

are working in circumstances corruptive of health and motherhood. It is, therefore, a vital problem for the future of our race, how to render the conditions of industry compatible with the physical and moral health of women. And to one who knows a little about human nature and the wisdom of representative government, it is clear that the only first step in solution of that problem is to give to the women themselves the dignity and defense of political recognition.

Compared to the variety of their needs and the subtlety of the disadvantages under which they enter a competitive system, it is a small thing to give them. But it is the first and manifest thing. It is the ancient antidote for that prejudice which everywhere opposes them, and its smallness is not a reason for withholding, but for bestowing it. Give them that small thing for which Anglo-Saxon men have groveled and lied and slaughtered and perished for a thousand years to win—namely, a little bit of the personal sacredness of sovereigns before their rulers and the law. A small thing, but their own,—and an indispensible prerequisite and guaranty of every other privilege or opportunity you may hope to confer upon them.

Women have that guaranty in a male democracy, it is stated, through their husbands and fathers who represent them. And to an extent the statement is true. To an extent it is true, even when the husbands and fathers have none of that perfect loyalty to them which the statement assumes, for the habit of mind which democracy engenders in its officials involuntarily extends to their dealing with the unenfranchised. But there is a time when it is not true, and a point where the habit of mind does not extend. And it is a crucial point for them—when as a class they, the unenfranchised workers, segregate themselves and dare to stand alone for their special aims in a labor organization. Then they are severed in our mind, as they are in fact, from any voter who might represent them; and then, above all, they need standing in the political system. For there are just two dependable guaranties of the effectiveness of an organization of people without wealth, and one is gunpowder and the other is the ballot.

"Why, the ballot never helped the working classes," we hear it exclaimed. "Organization is the sole hope of labor!" But such ignorance of the history and significance of popular sovereignty is revealed in the exclamation, that one knows not with what kind of kindergarten instruction to begin to answer it. He has read nothing or he has read in vain of nineteenth-cen-

tury democracy who thinks that labor organizations of males could have arrived where they are, in the respect of men and the law, if they had been unable to compel consideration from the State. It is because organization is the sole hope of labor that labor must have its portion of the sovereignty. And it is because, when united together for their special purposes, women lose even that second-hand sovereignty they are elsewhere alleged to have, that they must have a first-hand sovereignty. They must have a genuine guaranty that their needs shall be of consequence to the community they serve. Such certified consideration from the powers of law is both a symbol and a force indispensable to any group, or person, that either desires or is compelled by fortune, to enter the competitive world.

A hearing was recently held at Albany upon a bill to limit the hours of women's labor. Twelve big employers appeared against the bill, stating that the working women do not want it. Five elected delegates from the working women's organizations appeared in favor of the bill, stating that they do want it. No woman appeared against the bill. That was a drawn conflict of two vital interests in the State. The stronger and wealthier and better organized of those interests we clothe with the whole power and prestige of political citizenship, and the knowledge of political methods. The weaker and poorer and less organized we leave with no power and no standing in the community, and no political experience whatever. We let those employers come down to the Capitol and demand what they want from their representatives, and we make those workers come up and beg what they want from somebody else's representatives. The idea of such a hearing upon such a bill ought to disgust every clear-minded American with this old-fashioned masculine pretence at representative government.

Such is the argument from the ideal of democracy, theoretic, practical, and coercive in the concrete present. Yet, in so far as we are moral, in so far as we are believers in the progressive enrichment of life, we have something more to do than live up to our ideals. We have to illumine and improve them continually. The Athenian youths had a running-match in which they carried torches, and it was no victory to cross the tape with your torch gone out. Such is the race that is set before us. And we may well remember—we in America who scorn the contemplative life—that no amount of strenuousness with the legs will keep a flame burning while you run. You will have to be thinking.

And it is out of a thoughtful endeavor, not merely to live up to an ideal of ours, but to develop it greatly, that the suffrage movement derives its chief force. I mean our ideal of womanhood. It is not expected by the best advocates of this change that women will reform politics or purge society of evil, but it is expected, with reasoned and already proved certainty, that political knowledge and experience will benefit women. Political responsibility, the character it demands and the recognition it receives, will alter the nature and function of women in society to the improvement of themselves and their husbands and their children and their homes. Upon that ground we can declare that it is of vital importance to the advance of civilized life, not only to give the ballot to those women who want it, but to rouse those women who do not know enough to want it, to a better appreciation of the great age in which they live.

EXCERPTS FROM THE LADIES' BATTLE.

Mollie Elliott Seawell.

One of the strangest features of the woman suffrage movement is that suffrage is treated throughout, not as a means, but as an end. In suffragist speeches and writings, no mention is made of what women would do, if they had a vote, beyond certain philanthropic movements and municipal ordinances supposed to be for the betterment of women and children.

The anti-suffragists are in an enormous majority. This huge majority has an instinctive dislike to the overturning of the social order which woman suffrage would bring, but it has reasoned little more than a person reasons who runs indoors from a hailstorm. The inconveniences of remaining exposed to a hailstorm are so plain that few persons work the matter out logically; they act on instinct, which, unlike reason, makes no mistakes. Still, if an effort were made forcibly to expose persons to hailstorms, a dozen conclusive reasons would, at once, be found why they should go indoors. Mr. William Dean Howells has said that he has heard many appeals against woman suffrage, but he has never heard any reasons against it; yet there are compelling reasons against it. These reasons are not, in the smallest degree, based upon the assumption that women are not equal to men, but merely that men and women are not identical.

Idaho is dominated to a great degree by the Mormon Church, which has ever been the good friend of woman suffrage, and

the most powerful advocate it has yet had. In Utah, the women voters, under the lead of Mormonism, have voted steadily in favor of polygamists and law-breakers, who have been sent to Congress, in defiance of the law, by the votes of women.

When women suffrage was adopted in Colorado in 1893, the State had the highest divorce rate of any State or territory in the Union. When Washington adopted woman suffrage in 1910, that State led every State and territory in the Union, in divorce.

If the English newspapers are to be believed, New Zealand is one of the most corrupt electorates in the world. Nor does it seem a model in other respects, according to a late official report of Mr. Paul, Minister of Justice, on prison reform. He says: "The problem is not an easy one, nor is it a small one. A large proportion of the native born population is yearly going to prison."

In this case, as from the beginning of representative government, the ballot was recognized, not as a right, but as a privilege, which could be withheld from intelligent, qualified persons, as well as from the unqualified. As Senator Elihu Root, one of the greatest living jurists, has tersely put it, "But if there is any one thing settled, it is that voting is not a natural right, but simply a means of government."

No doubt Senator Root had in mind the decision of Chief Justice Marshall, "The granting of the franchise has always been regarded in the practice of nations, as a matter of expediency, and not as an inherent right." It has always been treated as a privilege by the Supreme Court of the United States, and must therefore be defined as a privilege.

Under the government of the United States, the normal voter must have two qualifications. First, he must, except in occasional individual instances, be physically able to make his way to the polls, against opposition if necessary; and, second, he must be able to carry out by force the effect of his ballot. Law consists of a series of Thou-shalt-nots, but government does not result until an armed man stands ready to execute the law. Force converts law into government. In civilized countries there are three methods of converting law into government—fine or compensation, imprisonment, and death. For all of these, physical force is necessary. To create an electorate unable to use physical force, is not, as the suffragists seem to think, merely doubling the present electorate. It means pull-

ing out the underpinning, which is force, from every form of government the world has yet known.

The trouble would begin with the mere attempt of women to deposit their ballots. A dozen ruffians could prevent a hundred women from depositing a single ballot. There can be no doubt that this means would be used by the rougher elements, and that the polls would become scenes of preordained disorder. In London, on April 2, 1911, a gang of roughs barred a crowd of suffragists from a skating rink hired by them. The women were helpless, and the roughs were subdued by some men suffragists marching with the women.

Meanwhile, the police stood by, laughing and inactive. Suppose the skating rink had been a polling place? Against the disturbances which would occur, women might invoke the law, but they could not enforce it. They would be dependent upon that moiety of men who might be willing to assist them. The constabulary has always proved totally inadequate to maintain order at the polls when there was a determined effort at disorder; and there is in the American nation a fixed hostility to the employment of troops at polling places. It is a fact, probably unknown to the suffragists, that every administration which has ever passed a force bill, or even made a serious endeavor to do so, has lost the House of Representatives at the next election. This has given rise to the axiom that an electorate which cannot protect itself is not worth protecting, and the country is better off without it than with it. This principle has worked unerring since the foundation of the Republic, and is in itself the natural protection of the ballot.

In recent magazine article, Mrs. Clarence Mackey, a leading suffragist, advances with much simplicity the proposition that influence such as women now possess, without responsibility, is a very bad thing. She proposes to substitute the authority of the ballot in place of influence, but still without responsibility. If influence without responsibility is dangerous, authority without responsibility must be a thousand times more dangerous. It is, in fact, the most dangerous thing on earth. The suffragists are not always as logical as Aristotle, nor as subtle as Ulysses. Suffrage is not a simple thing. It is one of the most complex things on this planet; it has its dangers, and its consequences reach far and last long. Man suffrage differs from woman suffrage. Perhaps the Supreme Being made a ridiculous blunder in creating sex, but it is now too late to remedy it.

In the District of Columbia with its 343,005 inhabitants, no man has a vote there, but no man has had the assurance so far to ask exemption from taxation. The entire Army and Navy of the United States, including the officers, the best educated body of men in the country, are practically disfranchised through difficulty in establishing domicile, and for other reasons. Yet army and navy men are required to pay taxes just as much as civilians.

The idea that taxation carries with it a vote is peculiarly ludicrous when employed by suffragists from the South. There is probably not one of them to be found who advocates restoring the franchise to the two million negro voters increased by two more millions of ignorant negro women-voters; but the Southern suffragists have not so far proposed to exempt the ten million negroes in the South from taxation. But if no one should be taxed who has not a vote, then those ten million negroes should be exempt from taxation; also all lunatics, minors, and criminals; all army and navy officers and men; all the inhabitants of the Territories and of the District of Columbia.

The million or more foreigners who are added annually to our population would also be exempt from taxation for at least five years—the shortest time, under our present naturalization laws, in which an alien may become a voter. But this would only be the beginning of the exemption. Citizenship cannot be forced upon any man, and immigrants might choose to remain aliens, and no doubt would, in order to escape taxation.

This brings to mind the stern words of the late Queen Victoria, the first sovereign on earth who understood, maintained and observed a constitution, and who, in the sixty-four years of her reign had more governmental experience, more practical knowledge of politics than any woman who ever lived. "The Queen is most anxious to enlist every one who can speak or write in checking this mad, wicked folly of 'Woman's Rights' with all its attendant horrors."

Nothing illustrates better the political ignorance of the militant suffragists than the notion that the legislative body of any civilized country in time of peace, would dare to legislate **at the dictation of a mob.** When that is done, it means, as was sometimes the case in the French Revolution and the Commune in 1871, that the mob rules, and a section of it legislates. If the Liberal government had so much as mentioned the suffrage bill, with the shrieking rioters outside the building, it would have been hurled from power inside of twenty-four hours. To

yield to a mob of suffragists one day, would be to yield to a mob of socialists the next day, and a mob of anarchists the day after. Mrs. Pankhurst, in a speech in Paris in January, 1911, openly threatened to make trouble at the coronation of King George if the suffrage bill was not passed. But in civilized countries, laws are not passed under threats of violence. Mrs. Pankhurst ought to read history. If woman suffrage should prevail, it would be necessary to change the present form of government.

The first is, the suffrage contention that voting is a moral right. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that voting is not a moral right, but a privilege. It would be necessary to change the Constitution of the United States in order to override the Supreme Court.

Second, women voters would inevitably become a privileged class, their mere exemption from military and naval duty making them such. The first fundamental of our present form of government is, that there shall be no privileged classes among voters.

Third, the suffrage claim, that the United States could live under an electorate of which less than half could enforce its laws, would necessitate a large standing army, as in those countries where the electorate is not strong enough to enforce its laws.

Fourth, the government of the United States is based upon the rule of the majority, and not on the consent of the governed; and the suffragists, by their own showing, have less than three per cent. of women of the country on their side. Therefore, when women vote, the present form of government must be fundamentally changed, to admit of the overruling of the Supreme Court, privileged classes of voters, a large standing army and the rule of the minority.

SELECTIONS.—Affirmative.

Jane Addams in Ladies' Home Journal, January, 1910.

If woman would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger factory children who must find their recreation on the street; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries on her immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot—that latest implement of self-government. May we not fairly say that

American women need this implement in order to preserve the home?

Last Protest Against Woman's Enfranchisement.
James L. Hughes in Arena, July, 1894.

Duty is the broad ground on which the question rests. Thousands of pure, home-living women sincerely believe it to be their duty to vote, in order to help decide great social and national questions that affect the well-being of their country and their homes. They surely have as well defined a right to vote as those have to oppose woman's enfranchisement. This is an age of individual liberty. Right and duty and conscience should guide us. Even majorities should never tyrannize over minorities in such a way as to prevent the honest expression of opinions in the most effectual way—by marking a ballot.

Women demand no special laws. She asks her place as a citizen, and wishes only to stand, a free woman, side by side with her brother man to aid in working out the highest destiny of humanity. Where her influence would be evil instead of good she has no desire to go. More than this, she is willing to trust enlightened and liberal men to decide in regard to the justness and the wisdom of her claims to the right to a higher and broader sphere of duty.

Woman is governed by law as man is; woman may own property and pay taxes as man does; woman is interested in the home and in the state as fully as man is; woman is as much interested in her children as man is; woman is a responsible individual, quite as much as man is. It is unjust to say that every abstract claim of right that can be established in favor of man's voting does not belong equally to woman.

An Equal Suffrage State in Earnest.
An editorial in World's Work for February, 1912.

The men of California gave woman the suffrage and now find that they have enfranchised nearly a hundred thousand more voters than they can themselves muster. The subject has its jocular aspect. Suppose, for example, some issue should arise whereon there would be a division of opinion by sex!

Both the jocular and serious aspects are emphasized by the political zeal of the women. Every woman's club in California has turned to the study of American history and of the problems of the day. Even the women who opposed suffrage, or were indifferent to it, take their new status with a sober sense of its responsibilities. They are diligently studying the proper-

use of the ballot. It may be that the men did better than they guessed.

The Woman and the Home.

A. Caswell Ellis.

They tell us that the first duty of woman is as mother and the highest sphere of woman is the home. True, and that it is which places upon woman the obligation to enter into the life of her community and nation and help to make them a fit home for her child and her family. Before her child begins to take food her mother's duty commads her to see that there is an efficient dairy and food inspection in her city, state and nation, that her child be not poisoned by impure food; before dread disease shall have slipped into her home and struck down her child, her mother's duty commands her to do her share in awakening the public to the need of better sanitary laws and of their rigid enforcement; before her child goes into the streets, as he must soon go, her mother's duty commands her to see to it that these streets are safe, to see to it that her child be not corrupted there by degrading shows, immoral pictures, or dens for human dissipation and debauchery; when her child goes into the school, then the school becomes a part of her home, and her mother's duty commands her to see that conditions are provided in that school that will strengthen and develop in a sane way the mind and body of her little one; when the laws are being made under which her child must live, and by means of which the opportunities to develop the God-given possibilities of his nature are to be provided, or the door of opportunity is to be shut in his face, then her home becomes the nation and her mother's duty commands that she enter the struggle aganst the combined forces of the professional politician and commercial corruptionist, to see that the laws under which her innocent child must live shall not allow his tender body to be ground up in the mills of greedy commerce nor his pure soul blighted by the withering breath of political and social corruption.

Sooner or later it must be recognized that the duties of a true mother to her child and her home are not confined to the kitchen and back yard, nor can she evade her responsibility as a citizen by turning it over to her husband, any more than the husband can successfully turn over the family morals and religion to his wife.

The fact that so many people seem to think that a woman can go to school, go to the theater, trade and work in the stores,

attend banquets and public discussions, go to church, serve on important boards, read the papers and persuade her husband to vote right without harming herself, but that the minute she puts a ticket in a ballot box she will unsex herself, is simply an evidence of the power of a savage tradition and an indication of the lack of a sense of humor on the part of otherwise thoughtful men and women.—Quoted from Bulletin of the University of Texas.

FACTS AND OPINIONS.—Negative.

Mollie Elliott Seawell in "Ladies' Battle."

The shocking conduct of a part of the English suffragists has not been without its evil effects on American suffragists.

The first marked departure from the orderly procedure which had heretofore obtained among American suffragists occurred at the Spokane Convention, in July, 1909. The Convention was presided over by the Reverend Anna Howard Shaw, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association. The delegates grew violent, and finally about thirty dissidents were forcibly turned out of the church in which the sessions were held, and into an adjoining room, where they were locked in The proceedings then became riotous, and above the confusion the imprisoned delegates could be heard shrieking, "We will get even with you," and other menaces. The Reverend Anna Howard Shaw, who was in the chair, burst into tears, and said, "This has worked a ruinous influence upon the cause of suffrage."

The most shocking impropriety of all was the public insult to President Taft when he was their invited guest. The President yielded to strong pressure, and on the evening of April 15 made a short address to the suffragists assembled at the Arlington Hotel. The President spoke with the utmost courtesy and dignity, but on his making some guarded reference to the dangers attending the extension of the franchise, the suffragists proceeded to make history by hooting and hissing the President of the United States. This has never before occurred in the history of the country. No matter how hostile a crowd might be, or of what rough elements it might consist, the President of the United States has always been treated with respect. A number of the suffragists, realizing their frightful blunder, sent a letter of apology to the President. The action, however, was not unanimous.

Suffrage would not increase the physical strength of women;

it would not keep them at work if they had a good opportunity to escape from it; it would not prevent them from marrying if they wished to; and it would not make them any more amenable to discipline. Suffrage will not enlarge the scope of a a woman's employments. It will not enable them to climb telegraph poles or to construct battleships or to build skyscrapers. It would have no effect upon either their work or their wages, work and wages being entirely controlled by the law of supply and demand.

It is, however, the steady and universal contention of the suffragists that a vote would put the wages of women on a level with that of men, doing the same work. If that were true, the wages of women in the suffrage states would exceed those of women in the non-suffrage states. Such is not the case . In the suffrage states, women are no better paid than in the non-sufrage states, and in some employments, not so well paid. In no one of the suffrage states do women teachers receive as high wage as men teachers. In Wyoming and Utah, women teachers are paid a trifle over 69 per cent. of the wages as compared with men; in Indiana and Missouri, 90 per cent., and in New Mexico, 99 per cent. In no case does suffrage or non-suffrage affect the result. It is regulated by the inevitable law of supply and demand.

Then, if all women did not vote right and vote alike on philanthropy and sanitation, it would necessitate a law like the celebrated act of a Parliament, of Henry the Eighth of England, which he caused to be passed and called, with austere simplicity, "An Act to abolish Diversities of Opinion." But not even Henry the Eighth could carry that law into effect, and he was one of the most powerful sovereigns who ever lived, and had more personal influence than Miss Jane Addams. Then, there are already in Chicago, enough city ordinances and state and federal laws to make archangels of everybody in the town, if legislation could make people virtuous. It is indeed a simple business to deposit a piece of paper in a ballot box, but to enforce that ballot is something else. Besides, how has this simple business worked, of a woman depositing a piece of paper in a ballot box? Utah and Idaho have failed to put a stop to polygamy; on the contrary, the Polygamists are the chief supporters of woman suffrage. Colorado has been proved by official figures to be the most corrupt electorate in this country, and New Zealand, where women have full suffrage, has been proved to be the most corrupt electorate in the British Empire.

There are, of course, in the suffrage body, that proportion of professional agitators which are found in all movements. Then, there are numbers of women, who wish to be prominent and to get into print. Suffrage affords an easy method of doing this, because the suffragists have assumed that any and everybody may speak and write on this subject. But the great contributory cause to suffrage, is the general absence of conscious humor among women. The suffragists have not that subtle sixth sense, which tells them when they have aroused "the unextinguishable laughter of mankind." It is that lack, which makes them plan in New York City a suffrage parade, with carriages full of old ladies, and drawn by young ladies, and in general, resembling more a Mardi Gras procession than a serious performance; which filled Carnegie Hall with eager suffragists, listening breathlessly to the lucubrations on suffrage of a twenty-year old English girl; and which caused a prominent New York suffragist to proclaim boldly her belief in polygamy. There is no lack of unconscious humor among the suffragists. They plead for a voter's share in the government, but the science of government, itself, they treat as if it were, like Romeo's first love, an inconsiderable thing, hardly worth mentioning.

In Massachusetts the anti-suffragists were brilliantly successful in the matter of the so-called Referendum of 1895. The Massachusetts Legislature passed a bill, submitting to the men voters, and to the women voters entitled to vote on school committees, the question whether municipal suffrage be granted to women. The suffragists sought to avoid the test and appealed to the governor to veto the bill after it had passed. Both sides among women went actively into the campaign. The anti-suffragists, with admirable strategy, decided to remain away from the polls, while exerting all their influence against the proposed measure. The votes of the men and the women were kept separate. The result was a majority of men opposed to the bill of 100,006. Out of an estimated number of 575,000 women of voting age, only 22,204 voted in favor of the bill. In 47 towns, not one woman's vote was recorded in favor of it, and in 138 towns the suffragists secured in each 15 votes or less; 864 votes were cast against it.

It has also been conceded for many centuries that women are the chief beneficiaries of monogamy, and the chief sufferers by lax marriage and divorce laws. The proposition need only be stated to prove itself—that the limiting, if not actual wiping

out, of divorce is the greatest question, not only of the family, but of the state, before the women of this country. But it is a striking and vital fact that although claiming to be the party of reform, so far as the suffragists are concerned, they have avoided in all their public and printed utterances, the slightest allusion to, much less condemnation of, divorce, except recommendations to make it easier. In New York State, the suffragists, under the lead of the late Miss Anthony, strove for years to have habitual drunkenness made a cause of absolute divorce, instead of legal separation. This illustrates in a peculiar manner, the short-sightedness of most of the legislation proposed by the suffragists. A man, anxious to get rid of his wife, but having no legal cause, could, by the simple process of continually getting drunk, offer a strong inducement to his wife, to get a divorce.

But that woman suffrage tends to divorce, is plain to all who know anything of men and women. Political differences in families, between brothers, for example, who vote on differing sides, do not promote harmony. How much more inharmonious must be political differences between a husband and wife, each of whom has a vote which may be used as a weapon against the other? What is likely to be the state of that family, when the husband votes one ticket, and the wife votes another? Human nature is so imperfect that most men vote for what they believe to be their interests, and they can readily bring themselves to believe that their moral interests are identical with their material interests. Even when a voter is willing to vote against his temporary advantage, he always expects to profit in the long run. The woman voter will think likewise. It is doubtful if many marriages could withstand the strain of the husband and wife antagonizing each other's supposed interests, prejudices and convictions. The more highly civilized the community, the more these cases of difference would occur. Whoever expects woman suffrage to have a wholesome effect on marriage, will expect grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. And here comes in a question so vast and so far reaching, that it cannot be answered, and is "deeper than ever plummet sounded." What will be the effect of suffrage on women themselves? Will it make them more intelligent, more courageous, more patient, more tender, in short, more feminine, for femininity is the glory of a woman? Would Jeanne d'Arc have done more for her country, if she had been a voter? Or would a vote have doubled the strength of Charlotte Corday's slender arm? Would

Isabella of Castile, Marie Theresa and Queen Vivtoria have been abler sovereigns if they had believed in woman suffrage? Would Mary, the mother of Washington, have been able to do a better part by her man-child, who said, "All that I am, my mother made me," if she had been a voter? These women managed, without a vote, to do immortal things. The suffragists cannot hope to surpass them.

MEASURING UP EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

An Authoritative Estimate of Results in Colorado.

By George Creel and Judge Ben B. Linsey.

Colorado, better, perhaps, than any other state, affords an opportunity for a fair appraisal of equal suffrage's value, of its merits and demerits, its efficiency or its failure. This commonwealth is peculiarly suited for such an examination by reason of the typical Americanism that marks its people and its problems.

If the matter were pinned down to a specific result, and discussion limited to one concrete outcome, equal suffrage could well afford to rest its case on the findings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. This globe-circling organization of men and women, who play important parts in the public affairs of their various countries, is on record as declaring that "Colorado has the sanest, the most humane, the most progressive, most scientific laws relating to the child to be found in any statute books in the world." And of these laws which drew such praise from impartial sociologists, not one but has come into operation since Colorado's adoption of equal suffrage in 1895; not one but owes either its inception or its success to the voting women. Even in these cases where the law was not originated, not especially championed by them, they elected the official responsible for the law, and whose candidacy had its base in revolt and reform.

The list is as long as splendid; laws establishing a state home for dependent children, three of the five members of the board to be women; making mothers joint guardians of their children with the fathers; raising the age of protection for girls to eighteen years; creating juvenile courts; making education compulsory for all children between the ages of eight and sixteen, except the ailing, those taught at home, those over fourteen who have completed the eighth grade, those who support themselves, or whose parents need their help and support; establishing truant or parental schools; forbidding the insuring of the lives of children under ten; making it a criminal offense for parents or

other persons to contribute to the delinquency of children; forbidding children of sixteen or under to work more than eight hours a day in any mill, factory or store or in any other occupation that may be deemed unhealthful; requiring that at least three of the six members of the Board of County Visitors be women; establishing a State Industrial Home for Girls, three of the five members of the Board of Control to be women, including instruction concerning the humane treatment of animals in the public school course; providing that any person employing a child under fourteen in any mine, smelter, mill, factory or underground works, shall be punished by imprisonment in addition to fine; abolishing the binding out of industrial home girls until twenty-one, and providing for parole; forbidding prosecuting and arresting officers from collecting fees in cases against children; providing that at least two thousand dollars of the estate of a deceased parent shall be paid to the child before creditors' claims are satisfied.

These laws, directly concerned with the welfare of the child, are supplemented by the following safeguards thrown about motherhood, the home, and general sociological conditions:

Laws making father and mother joint heirs of deceased children; requiring joint signature of husband and wife to every chattel mortgage, sale of household goods used by the family, or conveyance or mortgage of homestead; making it a misdemeanor to fail to support aged or infirm parents; providing that no woman shall work more than eight hours a day at labor requiring her to be on her feet; requiring one woman physician on the board of the insane asylum; providing for the care of the feeble-minded, for their free maintenance, and for the inspection of private eleemosynary institutions by the State Board of Charities; making the Colorado Humane Society a State Bureau of child and animal protection; enforcing pure food inspection in harmony with the national law; providing that foreign life or accident insurance companies, when sued, must pay the costs; establishing a State Traveling Commission to consist of five women from the State Federation of Women's Clubs; and making it a criminal offense to fail, refuse or neglect to provide food, clothing, shelter and care in case of sickness of wife or minor child.

The woman voter has boldly and intelligently dealt with the "criminal problem," the "labor problem," and the "suffrage problem." Not only has the "indeterminate sentence" been written on the statute books, and probation laws of greatest

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

latitude adopted, but women serving on the penitentiary and reform school boards have practically revolutionized the conduct of penal institutions in Colorado. Broken men are mended now, not further cowed and crushed. A State Free Employment Bureau, with offices in all Colorado cities of more than twenty-five thousand, has worked wonders, and the bitter cry of the unemployed is less and less heard; and women have largely engineered the effective campagin in favor of direct legislation, and have been almost solidly behind the fight for the initiative and referendum, and direct primary, and the commission form of government.

At the last Denver election, held May 27, 1910, both Republican and Democratic parties were compelled to recognize the popular demand, and present charter amendments providing for the initiative, referendum, recall and a water commission. But, under the control of public service corporations, and practically financed by the water monopoly, which was asking for a new franchise, "fake" amendments were framed by the old parties. Skillful indeed was the wording—every amendment "looked good"—yet not one but had a "joker" in it. At the last moment a Citizens' Party took the field, women behind it, and a woman on the ticket. Real initiative, referendum and recall amendments were prepared, and a distinguished water commission named with power to either buy the water company's plant at a fixed figure, or build a new one.

Against both organizations, corporation money, and every professional politician and party henchmen, the Citizens' ticket won an overwhelming victory. Denver now possesses the initiative, referendum and recall; and by virtue of a bond issue carried September 6, 1910, Denver will build its own water plant, and be forever freed from as arrogant and rapacious a monopoly as ever cursed a community.

And the women voters led!

Equal suffrage has been one of the great first causes of these laws, reforms and revolt. Surely, in the face of such results, fair-minded people must be shown a tremendous counterbalancing of injury and evil before they can justly condemn the movement. And what is it that the anti-equal suffragists chiefly urge? That "it destroys the home."

Since it is admittedly the case that equal suffrage has safeguarded the home by scientific laws, and sweetened and bettered communal conditions directly bearing upon the home, this charge must be regarded as specifically leveled at the women

in the home. In fact, the more blackguardly critics have not hesitated to declare that "the character of the Colorado woman is steadily deteriorating under the influence of the ballot."

It is, of course, a charge that defies detailed disproof. To those who have visited Colorado, admired the conjunction of taste and care that marks the Colorado home, and rejoiced in the intelligence and refinement of the State's womanhood, the slander is at once apparent. To others the only thing that can be offered is a flat denial from every Colorado man.

Why, in the name of reason, should the mere fact of voting work deterioration in any woman? It does not take any mother "away from her home duties" to spend ten minutes going to the polls, casting her vote, and returning to the bosom of her family, but during those ten minutes she wields a power that is doing more to protect her home, and all other homes, than any other possible influence.

Equal Suffrage Testimonials.

1. In January, 1899, the Colorado State Legislature passed, by a vote of 45 to 3 in the House and 30 to 1 in the Senate, the following resolution:

"Whereas, Equal suffrage has been in operation in Colorado for five years, during which time women have exercised the privilege as generally as men, with the result that better candidates have been selected for office, methods of election have been purified, the character of legislation improved, civic intelligence increased, and womanhood developed to greater usefulness by political responsibility; therefore,

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That in view of these results the enfranchisement of women in every State and Territory of the American Union is hereby recommended as a measure tending to the advancement of a higher and better social order."

"That an authenticated copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Legislature of every State and Territory, and the press be requested to call public attention to them."

2. In 1898, in answer to the continued misrepresentations of the Eastern press, the friends of woman suffrage issued the following:

"We the citiens of the State of Colorado, desire, as lovers of truth and justice, to give our testimony to the value of equal suffrage. We believe that the greatest good of the home, the state, and the nation is advanced through the operation of equal

suffrage. The evils predicted have not come to pass. The benefits claimed for it have been secured or are in process of development. A very large proportion of Colorado women have conscientiously accepted their responsibility as citizens. In 1894 more than half the total vote for governor was cast by women. Between 85 and 90 per cent. of the women of the state voted at that time. The exact vote of the last election has not yet been estimated, but there is reason to believe that the proportional vote of women was as large as in previous years. The vote of good women, like that of good men, is involved in the evils resulting from the abuse of our present political system; but the vote of women is noticeably more conscientious than that of men, and will be an important factor in bringing about a better order."

"This was signed by the governor, three ex-governors, both senators, both members of congress and ex-senators, the chief-justice and two associate justices of the supreme court, three judges of the court of appeals, four judges of the district court, the secretary of state, the state auditor, attorney-general, the mayor of Denver, the president of the State University, the President of Colorado College, the representative of the General Federation of Women's clubs, the vice-president of the Mount Vernon Association, and the presidents of thirteen women's clubs."

3. "The most noteworthy result is the improved character of the candidates as one of the most important points to be considered is whether they can get the votes of women. The addition of a large number of independent and conscientious voters to the electorate; the wider outlook given to women herself through the exercise of civic rights; and the higher degree of comradeship made possible by the removal of political inequality between men and women; these are the greatest benefits which equal suffrage has brought to Colorado."

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

Judge Hailett and others.

"Our State has had the female suffrage plan a sufficiently long time to form a fair idea of its workings. I am not prejudiced in any way, but honestly do not see where the experiment has proved of benefit. The presence of women at the polls has only augmented the total vote; it has worked no radical changes. It has promoted no special reforms, and it has had no particularly purifying effect upon politics. There is a

growing tendency on the part of most of the better and more intelligent female voters of Colorado to cease exercising the ballot. They still go to the polls but need to be urged by some of their male relatives. I do not believe there will be any abrogation of the suffrage rights of women of our State, for the reason that no man who aspires to office would risk their displeasure by advocating the repeal of the law. At the same time if it were to be done over again the people of Colorado would defeat woman suffrage by an overwhelming majority."

The women voters of Colorado seem to have gone rapidly from bad to worse as the celebrated contested election case of Bonynge versus Shafroth shows in the First Congressional district of Colorado, containing the city of Denver. This case was investigated during the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress (H. R. report, No. 2705). The methods prevailing in the Colorado electorate were there fully and officially set forth. In this case the certificate of election had been given to Mr. Shafroth but was contested by Mr. Bonynge, and the ballot-boxes were brought to Washington and opened in the House of Representatives.

The ballot-boxes disclosed a state of corruption comparable only with the worst days of reconstruction in the south. Out of a total of nearly nine thousand ballots cast, six thousand were fraudulent. In this orgy of fraud and forgery, the women voters held their own gallantly. It was found that a bogus ballot had been placed in the boxes, and in many cases that six or eight or ten of these bogus ballots were folded together in such a way that they could not have been voted separately or legally. The handwriting experts testified that all these bogus ballots had been filled in by four persons, one of them a woman; that this woman had numbered hundreds of these bogus ballots, and had them placed in the ballot-boxes. On page 23 of the report, it will be noted that the polling-list contained 422 names, and was in the handwriting of a woman clerk of the poll. On page 24 it was shown that this woman voted three times, and she also wrote in the party designation for many of the ballots. On the same page it is shown that another woman signed the certificate in two places purporting to have been signed by two other clerks. Certificates in a poll-book, purporting to be signed by each of the judges, were found to be in the handwriting of a woman, a clerk of the poll. On page 5 it is stated that although the names of seventy-five women appear on a poll-list, the

committee found but two ballots on which the party name at the top appeared to be in the handwriting of women.

It was also proved that two women arranged to have a fight started so as to distract the attention of the watchers at the polls, while a third woman stuffed the ballot-boxes.

Associated Press Dispatch, Denver, May 17, 1910:

"That Denver has gone 'wet' seems assured by the returns received up to eight o'clock tonight. Betting on a 'wet' majority is two to one, with very little 'dry' money in sight."

The election went, two to one in favor of the "wets." This moved a leading Colorado newspaper, the Fort Collins Express, to say, in its issue of May 17th, 1910:

"On moral questions the laws of Colorado are famous for their weakness or absence. The liquor laws of Colorado are not up to the standard of other states. No search or seizure law is in effect in the state, and without such a law the illicit sale of liquor cannot be suppressed. The women of Colorado are on trial in regard to the suffrage movement. Their failure to benefit Colorado will injure the cause in other states more than anything else. If Colorado, as a result of woman suffrage had laws above the average, especially on moral questions and where the rights of women are affected, if it was a state that could be pointed to with pride in regard to its laws and their enforcement, if the city of Denver as a result of their ballot could be changed from the worst city, morally, in the land, to one of even average decency, then the suffragists could give a reason for asking for the franchise in other states."

Newspapers may be depended upon not to make these statements concerning their own communities, unless the proof be obvious and overwhelming It would be ruinous to the newspaper otherwise.

Some details of this election are furnished by Mr. Richard Barry, a representative of the Ladies' Home Journal, in the issue of November 1st, 1910. The election was preceded some months before by a meeting of the woman's political organization, at which the women fought with fists. At the election in May, 1910, the sale of women's votes was open and shameless. At each of the 211 voting precincts in Denver, there were four women working in the interest of the saloon-keepers. These women had previously visited the headquarters of the saloon-keepers and openly accepted each a ten dollar bill for her services. In this, and in other ways, Mr. Barry says he saw about $17,000 paid to women voters, who apparently made no effort

to conceal it, as indeed it would have been useless. One woman, whose business it was to challenge every temperance voter at a certain polling place, did her work so well that by twelve o'clock only fourteen temperance votes had been cast. The policeman on duty threatened to arrest her, when the manager of the 'wets' replied, "You'll not arrest her. If you do, I'll have the polls closed and post a notice 'Closed! Women intimidated at the polls by the police.'"

The woman was not arrested. Such wholesale corruption has probably never been approximated in any city in the United States.

It is not surprising, after these revelations, that a strong movement was inaugurated, in January, 1911, among the soberer and more intelligent women of Colorado, headed by Mrs. Goddard, wife of the Chief Justice, to secure the repeal of the woman suffrage amendment to the constitution of the state.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

An Investigation by Helen M. Sumner.—Facts for Both Sides.

In those counties in which the amount of work is sufficient to justify a division of labor women are usually given the lower-salaried positions. Though it is almost universally asserted in Colorado that women receive the same pay as men in public employment it is evident that this is true only as between very minutely classified positions. By overstepping the bounds of a reasonable qualification, it may be said that women receive "equal pay for equal work," but, taking public employment as a whole, women receive considerably lower remuneration than men.

As teachers, also, women receive lower salaries on the average than men. Women who replace men in a school are not usually paid less than the men have received, but throughout the entire period included in the table, 1885-1906, women were apparently employed in the lower, and men in the higher, paid positions.

A comparison of the wages of teachers in Colorado with their wages in sixteen other states, shows that the average monthly salaries of both men and women teachers in Colorado are higher than in any of the other states with the exception of Massachusetts for men and California for women. It is noticeable, however, that men's salaries are higher proportionately to women's in Colorado than in the United States as a whole or in any division except the North Atlantic. That is, the difference

in the salaries of men and women teachers in Colorado, instead of being unusually small, is unusually large. This is probably due to the greater proportion of men employed in the higher positions. But the conclusion is inevitable that, on the whole, men teachers are better paid in Colorado than women teachers.

Women are generally much more difficult to organize in trade unions than men, and, once within the organization, they usually take less interest in its affairs. In unions by themselves, however, they take more active part than in mixed unions, where their role is usually a silent one, unless the proportion of women to men is very large. Unions almost universally demand "equal pay for equal work," which tends in some trades, it is said, to drive out the women, but at least equality is established in union shops. It has been found that women's unions usually flourish "in a locality where all trades are well organized and where the men workers have a strong union and women's work is supplementary rather than competitive with men's; in trades where a comparatively high standard of intelligence is found; where women are American born (though of foreign parents)." These are undoubtedly far more powerful factors in stimulating the organization of women in labor unions than their power to vote.

Colorado is not as advanced as many of the Eastern states in the matter of legal protection for women and children in industry.

An unexpected and to some persons discouraging feature of this question is that equal suffrage has not materially increased the strength of the Prohibition Party. In 1892 the Prohibition candidate for governor received less than 2 per cent. of the total vote cast for that office, and in 1896 only a trifle over 2 per cent. of the total vote. A Denver woman accounted for the weakness of the Prohibition Party by the statement that women "would vote Prohibition if the party had enough male votes to do much good, but they do not like to waste votes on a losing proposition." Another Denver woman remarked: "The women are almost universally for total abstinence, yet the Prohibition Party never gets their vote, and by reason of its insignificance is obliged to file its ticket by petition. Yet none of the parties dare nominate a saloon-keeper for office, except possibly an alderman now and then in the slums." The latter part of this statement, that equal suffrage has had a blighting influence over the political careers of saloon-keepers, is indisputably true, but it does not seem probable that women "are

almost universally for total abstinence." In several localities, indeed, women have frankly expressed a preference for the saloon over the drug-store sale of liquor, and the practice of "bootlegging," or carrying a bottle in the leg of the boot. Three or four persons who answered the question-blank, but were unfavorable to equal suffrage, thought that more women drink than before their enfranchisement. A Denver woman delegate, moreover, remarked that she had "heard women say they would not vote against liquor interests because they liked a glass of beer themselves."

Most of the persons who asserted that the influence of women has decreased were evidently comparing present conditions with those that prevailed during the early years of equal suffrage. A few, however, believed that the franchise itself has decreased their influence. A Boulder woman, for example, answered: "Decreasing in suffrage states, because they lose the quiet and more potential influence when they enter the public arena."

The chief cause cited for a decrease of influence was indifference, but many others were named. A member of the State Lgislature said that women "lose their influence as soon as they are tied to party politics." There was some complaint from others of discouragement and slackened efforts. A prominent Denver man said: "Women's influence in poltiics is on the decline. 1. Because they are not posted on the issues involved. 2. Because men discourage their participation. Our politicians do not desire their influence, but they dare not say so." Several persons asserted that the "better class" of women, after a little experience, became disgusted with politics. Two or three of these added that, as the influence of the "better class" decreases, that of the lower class increases, because "the party in power controls the votes of the harlots and courtesans and women of questionable character, and compels them to vote their way."

Corruption in Politics.

It is often said by equal-suffrage advocates that, if given the franchise, prostitutes would not vote, as they would not be interested and would not wish to give their names and addresses. This is a fallacy. True, they do not wish to vote. In the spring of 1895 they even sent a petition to the Woman's Republican Club of Denver, imploring the interference of that organization to prevent them from being compelled to register. But in spite of the request of the Republican women and the

promise of the fire and police board, they were obliged to register and vote at the city election of 1895, and they have been obliged to register and vote at nearly every election since that date. Before Denver received her new charter it was said that this was one of the evils of police boards appointed by the governor, but the police department has usually seemed to be in politics "to win," whether controlled by the state or the city.

Prostitutes generally vote, and their vote is cast solidly for the party in control of the police force. This is true not only in Denver, but usually in Pueblo, Cripple Creek, and Trinidad, and often in other cities. To those familiar with practical politics, where "the end" is held to "justify the means," this fact is not surprising. The vote of these women, to whom police protection is essential, is regarded as one of the prerequisites of the party in power.

Neither is it surprising to learn that the prostitutes vote not only once, but often more than once. Whenever "repeating" is to be done, their aid, naturally, is required. "Repeating" is usually effected on fraudulent registrations, though occasionally an innocent person goes to the polls to find that some one has already voted on his name, and that he is thereby disfranchised. Registration-books are most easily and unobtrusively "padded," as the saying is, in the rooming-house and red-light districts. Sometimes thirty or forty persons have been registered from small houses in this region where on investigation only six or eight legal voters could be discovered. Sometimes, when peculiar vigilance has been exercised, it has been made impossible for any one to vote on these fraudulent names, but undoubtedly the women of the "district" have often cast more than their fair proportion of votes.

The second reason for the increased political corruption is that women are bought cheaper than men. One of the Denver women delegates who did not believe in equal suffrage said: "More because they will work cheaper. Five dollars looks bigger to a woman than it does to a man." One man said that women can be bought "with a compliment;" and a woman put it, "with a smile." A Denver woman delegate told of a woman who made a practice of exchanging a hair tonic of her own concoction for votes; and a county chairman who did not believe in equal suffrage said: "Last fall I knew of a number of women voters in the county who sold their votes for dress patterns, etc., and refused to vote for certain candidates who did

not bring them candy or gum." A San Miguel county woman said: "There are a class of women who do not realize the sacredness of the responsibility of doing their part to elect good men and women to office, and who will sell their vote for a box of candy or less, while the same class of men will sell theirs at a little higher price."

Closely allied to this as a reason for the belief that women are more corrupt was the statement that more often than men they are in politics for money. A Teller county man, who was unfavorable to equal suffrage, said: "Women are more corrupt, more easily bought up, because, as a rule, a large percentage of the better class of women will not actively engage in political work, and a large percentage of those who take active interest do so for selfish reasons." A county chairman who also did not believe in equal suffrage answered: "Yes, because the women who take the most interest are from the lower classes and always look for the money." A considerably larger number of answers, however, were to the effect that women are less corrupt because they have less financial interest at stake than men.

The fourth reason given was that they are more petty. For instance, a La Plate county woman said: "More so, I am sorry to say, so far as my observation goes. They stoop to petty, unwomanly gossip, and stop at no scandal by which they can defeat a candidate against whom they have a grudge, and merit is not considered."

Fifth, was the belief that women are more reckless than men. One of the Denver men delegates who did not believe in equal suffrage said that women "will do boldly things a man might also do, but would try to hide," and a Teller county man who did not commit himself on the suffrage question suggested that women "do not figure on the fact that there will be another election some time." A La Plata man who believed in equal suffrage accounted for this greater recklessness by the fact that women are less familiar with the laws and are encouraged by "the amenities shown to the sex." Other persons, however, testified that women are less corrupt than men in politics because they are more timid.

A sixth reason was the assertion that women are more easily influenced than men, and a seventh that their code of honor in such matters is defective. A Teller county man who believed in equal suffrage thought that women are more corrupt, "as they do the men's bidding," and a La Plata county woman who

also believed in equal suffrage said: "Women are more corrupt because of inexperience and short-sightedness. They will do without knowing it is dishonorable an act considered in men's code below the mark."

Lastly was the belief expressed by several that women are often deceived or tricked into acts and methods which, if they were more experienced, they would recognize as corrupt. For instance, a Pueblo man who believed in equal suffrage answered: "They are more trusting or gullible, more partisan, less reasonable, and cheaper purchased. I have known women of standing, church-members, housewives, and mothers, in the employ of the machines at two to three dollars per day, to go from house to house and promulgate among the women the most vile and false and slanderous tales about candidates, and yet such women doubtless believe the stories which they tell." A woman of wide political experience remarked: "From what I have observed human nature is apt to show up in both sexes in politics as elsewhere. I should say that men are more openly and intentionally corrupt, but women, from long lack of necessity for acting on their own judgment, often blind themselves or permit others to blind them with the result that they do fully as questionable things as the men." In Pueblo, in January, 1905, a woman testified in court that she had assisted a man in making out dozens of fraudulent registration-sheets, and had received pay for this work on his assurance and her own belief that there was nothing wrong about the proceeding. It is not uncommon, for instance, for a Democratic woman to work for pay for the Republican Party, or the reverse, but this is not usually considered dishonest, even by her own party. The woman candidate for state representative, for instance, who received the largest number of votes in the Democratic Convention in Denver in 1906, had appeared as a canvasser for the Republican Party before the committee which investigated the gubernatorial election in 1904.

Conclusions.

The influence of equal suffrage over the machinery of party politics, though apparently not great, has probably been beneficial. Women have been slack, even more so than men, in the fulfillment of political duties other than voting. Few of them attend caucuses or primaries, but more serve as delegates to conventions, and their presence has a slight tendency to improve political platforms and the selection of candidates. "Planks" are sometimes introduced to "catch the woman vote,"

but they are no more lived up to than the planks introduced to catch other classes of votes. Saloon-keepers and men of questionable personal morality are usually, but not always, tabooed as candidates. This, however, does not necessarily improve the standard of public efficiency or honor. Few women, compared with the number of men, are corrupt in politics, but the red-light district is freely used by the party in power, and its women are compelled, not merely to vote, but often to repeat. Some complaint has been that equal suffrage, by adding a large number of uninterested voters to the electorate, has strengthened the hold of professional political manipulators. A Denver man, for instance, said that equal suffrage "increases the facilities of the 'ward heeler,' instead of neutralizing his force, as was expected." But there is little evidence to warrant such an assertion. Upon the whole, party politics appears to be upon a somewhat higher plane in Colorado since women have voted.

Women have shown their capacity for breaking away from party lines when moral issues became apparent. They need only the right kind of nominating machinery in order to express their rightful influence within party lines. It is no reflection, then on equal suffrage to show women's incapacity to cope with the existing machinery of nominations. Equal suffrage, indeed, serves to show, in the most striking way, the essential rottenness and degrading character of the existing systems.

Though they have gained in their proportion of county superintendents and members of school boards, the women of Colorado seem, in other directions, since the early years of equal suffrage, to have lost ground in the distribution of elective offices. This is due, however, not to any record of dishonesty or inefficiency in office, but to three factors of an entirely different nature. First, there are many men who have a hankering for office; they are more experienced, and often less scrupulous politicians than women; and they are upheld by a powerful public opinion of both sexes that the woman should not take the man's job. Second, there are comparatively few women who desire office; those who do so are frequently deterred by distaste for the methods required to secure it; and they are seriously handicapped by the discovery that other women in voting cling much closer to party than to sex lines. Third, the normal political and economic motives were at first somewhat obscured by the uncertain element of the woman

vote, and the men were not sure but they would be obliged to yield many offices in order to keep the new voters under the party whip. As things have settled down, however, they discovered that the offices given to women may be quite narrowly limited without materially endangering party supremacy.

The record of women in office has been high. It is difficult to secure an adequate measure of the efficiency and honesty of individual officeholders, but the general opinion prevails that women have given, as a Weld county man put it, "more attention to business and less to wire-pulling than men." There is no record of a woman defaulter, though men defaulters in county and city offices have been distressingly common.

Women office-holders have sometimes been accused of graft and of accepting bribes, but this has been only when charges of graft and bribery have been floating around in such numbers as to hit any one who stood in the lime-light. No such charge has ever been taken seriously enough to go beyond the opposition newspapers, and in only two or three cases have such accusations even gone beyond private conversation. In short, the record of women office-holders on the score of honesty is considerably above that of men office-holders.

Again, no woman has shown herself grossly inefficient in office, and several have made brilliant records—one, at least, attaining national eminence by reason of her excellent administration of the office of state superintendent of public instruction. In the matter of efficiency, then, women have made, on an average, better records than men. Their privilege of holding official positions has, moreover, brought out and developed talents which would otherwise have remained dormant and so have been lost to the state. It is unfortunate, however, that men and women rarely compete for the same office, because segregation along sex lines tends to hamper the selection of the fittest candidate. But, upon the whole the administration of women in public office has been at least as successful, and, all things considered, probably more so, than the administration of men.

In conclusion, it is safe to say that the most conspicuous effect of equal suffrage has been upon legislation, and, though it is impossible to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the woman's club movement alone would not have brought about the passage of the same laws, it seems probable that the votes of women have effected the desired end with less effort and in less time than would have been required in non-suffrage

states. When they were first enfranchised their influence may have been slightly stronger than at present, as they were then politically an unknown quantity, and the men, in order to win their votes, may have yielded more than later experience proved necessary. But they are still, to a certain extent, an unknown factor, as they split their tickets more often than men. For this reason, political bosses, as well as saloon men, are usually opposed to equal suffrage. They have never been known to favor "prize-fight" bills, or other laws of vicious tendency, and not more than twenty persons, in answering any of the questions relating to the effect of equal suffrage on legislation, expressed the opinion that it has been bad. Of these, nearly half thought stringent liquor laws, which they attributed to the woman vote, objectionable. Several of the others complained of the injustice of the 1895 "age of consent" law. Some persons considered the laws favored by women too radical, and others thought them too conservative.

Although the Colorado laws for the protection of working women and children might be greatly strengthened, and although the experience of older states furnishes a warning that such legislation should be enacted, if it is not to encounter grave difficulties, before urgent occasion for it has arisen, it is fair to say that, in other respects, no state has a code of laws better adapted to its immediate need for the protection of women and children, and that the influence of the enfranchised women has distictly strengthened the cause of reform in this particular. The direct influence of women who have taken active part has been one factor, but the indirect influence of the merely voting woman, by materially strengthening the backing of the men who have stood for reform measures in the interest of women and children, has been even more powerful.

The influence of the social settlements and of the Juvenile Court is, of course, potent in securing many of the reforms which settlement workers have also secured in other states and cities. But the proportion of women interested in these matters is almost everywhere larger than the proportion of men, and in Colorado there is inevitably, in the consideration of such questions, a tendency to yield to the wishes of that large element of the political constituency, the women. This tendency is not as great as might be wished, and there are sometimes other more powerful interests to be conciliated. Whenever a Colorado woman, however, makes a demand in which she may

reasonably be supposed to have the silent backing of the great mass of women who do not talk but vote, she inevitably has far less difficulty in obtaining her object than her sisters of the non-suffrage states. The possession of the ballot economizes for her both effort and time.

The effect of equal suffrage upon the women themselves, their outlook upon life, and their relationship to the home, is, in the opinion of many, the crux of the problem. Its effect upon party politics has been slight. But the reason is to be found primarily in the character of the present political machinery. To fully perform, under the existing system, the duties of an enfranchised citizen requires not only an inflexible moral code, but the public spirit, the self-immolation, and the unselfish devotion of a martyr. Politics in Colorado are at least as corrupt as in other states, and the woman of ideals who goes into political life for reform soon finds, not merely that she is working in the mire, but that she is persona non grata with the habitual denizens of the mire and with those persons who profit by its existence. Sometimes she becomes unutterably disgusted and ceases her political activity; sometimes her grit rouses antagonism, and she is more or less politely shoved out by experts at the business; and sometimes she stays and is taught "the tricks of the trade." The last case illustrates the one direct evil of equal suffrage, but, fortunately, it is of rare occurrence, and affects only women of weak moral fibre.

Over the majority of women, indeed, it is already evident that equal suffrage has exercised a good influence, and one which inevitably reacts, to a certain extent, upon political life. It has tended, for instance, to cultivate intelligent public spirit among the women of Colorado. Many have not been aroused; many have become discouraged and lost interest after the failure of their early efforts; comparatively few have taken an active part in political life; but thousands vote, and to every one of these thousands the ballot means a little broadening in the outlook, a little glimpse of wider interests than pots and kettles, trivial scandal, and bridge whist.

As for the loss in wonanly characteristics sometimes alleged to have resulted, it is difficult to find any evidence to show that voting affects this side of a woman's character more than purchasing a garden-hose. Families usually go to the poll together, old and young, men and women. In Pueblo, in 1906, one woman one hundred and two years old cast her first ballot. Many mothers have cast their first ballots with sons just arrived of

age. Women at the polls meet, not rough and unfamiliar persons, but their own neighbors and friends. In political conventions they often exchange receipts for cooking egg-plant and choice information about the baby, the servant, and the dressmaker, just as they would at any other gathering.

There are, it is true, a thousand and one psychological points in which women differ more or less decidedly from men, and their enfranchisement has probably tended to slightly modify some of these points of difference in some women. Social divisions, for instance, sometimes impede women's political work. They are not usually as democratic as men, primarily because they do not have as much occasion in their daily lives to associate with other classes than their own. But to assert that equal suffrage is capable of destroying real womanliness is to assert that the characteristicts which make women women and men men are only skin deep. As for man's chivalry, one woman remarked rather pathetically that she never knew what real chivalry meant until she could vote, and there are doubtless many others who have had the same experience. The fundamental emotional characteristics of men and women, whether good or bad, are far too deeply rooted to be subverted by the franchise privilege.

Equal suffrage has brought, then, practically no loss and some decided gain, the latter mainly evident in the effect of the possession of the ballot upon the women of Colorado. It has enlarged their interests, quickened their civic consciousness, and developed in many cases ability of a high order which has been of service to the city, the county and the state. Closely allied to this wider outlook and richer opportunity, and also distinctly visible as at least a tendency, is the development of the spirit of comradeship between the sexes. It is still too early to measure adequately these factors, and perhaps it will never be possible to determine exactly how much equal suffrage has contributed. But the Colorado experiment certainly indicates that equal suffrage is a step in the direction of a better citizenship, a more effective use of the ability of women as an integral part of the race, and a closer understanding and comradeship between men and women.

DIGESTS OF VARIOUS ARTICLES.—Affirmative.

1. The woman who has no interest larger than the affairs of her children is not a fit person to train them.

2. The rich may say that "women should stay at home and

cook the dinner;" but the poor know that often if women did stay at home there would be no dinner to cook.

3. It is an accepted maxim that all just government rests on the consent of the governed; but our present government does not rest on this basis.

4. Men vote because they are men, there is no other reason under heaven than that; and women have the right to vote because they are women, because with men they are a part of humanity.

5. Some refuse to give the vote to a certain class of citizens because they are in the majority. This is about the most extraordinary reason for refusing a vote the perverted ingenuity of man could devise.

6. As society grows more complicated, it is necessary that women shall extend her sense of responsibility to many things outside of her own home if she would continue to preserve the home in its entirety.

7. In the past, men, legislating as a class for women as a class, have done exactly what every ruling class has always done throughout the history of the world—they have discriminated against the class which had no legal voice.

8. The indifference of women objection is met with a reminder that all struggles for reform—even such a manifest reform as the abolition of child labor—encounter an enormous mass of indifference among average good American people.

9. The movement for woman's suffrage is a part of the world's evolution of democracy. The reasons for its existence are the same as for the previous struggles of man for suffrage. It presents all the old arguments and many new ones.

10. It is amusing that in the discussion of woman's suffrage the traditional position of the sexes has been reversed; the women have all the logic; and even the most intelligent men when opposing woman's suffrage resort largely to satire and gossip.

11. The only just and reasonable policy is to give women the ballot. Those who wish to use it will do so, and so justify all the arguments of the affirmative. Those who do not wish to vote will not vote, and so justify all the arguments of the negative.

12. It is impossible to judge of the potentialities of women as compared with men by what has actually been recorded of achieved results, so long as those incentives which are the

greatest spur to human effort are present in the case of men and absent in the case of women.

13. Women in common with all other citizens have social duties, or duties to society which can only be efficiently performed by the ballot. The state needs and has a right to her service at the polls. The state needs woman's vote fully as much if not more than women themselves.

14. Since the state has taken over the great functions of social service which used to belong to women—the teaching of children, the care of the sick, etc.—women must maintain their share in these functions through political means, or be dispossessed of their share of human activity.

15. Men are responsible for the sanitary conditions under which the children live, but women are held responsible for the results of those conditions. If women are held responsible for the results, in simple justice they must be allowed to have something to say as to what these conditions shall be.

16. The common reasoning is thus: Boys and girls are acknowledged to be distinct beings. Now boys study Greek and Algebra, Law and Medicine. Therefore girls should not. It is as if one should say: Boys and girls are distinct beings. Now boys eat beef and potatoes. Therefore obviously, girls should not.

17. We eat our breakfast as human beings, not as men and women; and it is the same with nine-tenths of our interests and duties in life. Let us not set out with the theory that a boy may avail himself of all the divisions of labor in modern society, but that every girl must still spin her own cloth and sew her own seams.

18. We may be very sure that we shall never know the sphere of any responsible human being until he has perfect freedom of choice and liberty of growth. All we can clearly see is that the intellectual capacity of women is an inexplicable waste of reserved power, if its utmost education is justly to be deprecated as useless or undesirable.

19. It is said that a woman ought to be satisfied to influence her husband's vote. But suppose the husband's conviction is different? Shall he lose his vote to please his wife? And if he did, how would it differ from bribery? What is the difference in principle between voting to please his wife, or for two dollars, or for a dish of macaroni?

20. The present tendency of government is to involve itself more and more in direct industrial enterprise—a tendency

which puts the men workers in the position of having their biggest employers elected by public election, while at the same time the government mechanically gets its female labor as cheap as it can, unchecked by political considerations.

21. While many women would doubtless line up with regular parties, there is no question but that they would add immensely to the independent and uncertain vote; and the increase of this vote is the greatest necessity of American political life. It is only by such vote that new measures can be considered on their merits, or parties held to strict accountability.

22. It must be conceded that it has been women's votes which have sustained Judge Lindsay in his struggle with the "Beast" in Denver. It is clear that if Illinois women had not had votes they could not have prevented the removal of Mrs. Young from the superintendency of schools in Chicago. These are facts and count infinitely more than any amount of hazy theory.

23. If it follows that women, to gain the suffrage, must show that a better state of society will follow the granting of the privilege, why was not the same test applied when the same extension of suffrage was granted in the case of men? Why is not the same test applied to every foreigner who has become naturalized and to every man when he reaches voting age?

24. If, in the case of women, it were conceded that the matter ought to be decided by majority rule, then it ought to be decided, as other questions put to men are decided, by the wish of the majority of those caring enough about the matter to vote upon it. This is never proposed by anti-suffragists, and is the last thing to which they would be willing to consent.

25. Some women wish they were men. This is terrible. And every thoughtful man must ask himself if his injustice or unfairness to woman has caused it. Most men are willing that women should vote if they wish to. Even if it were not best either for them or for the race very many men are willing to let them decide it themselves. Men must concede all that tends to equalize woman's lot.

26. It is claimed that women cannot held public office and care for children. This is true; but all women are not permitted to rear children. And after the children are reared there remain many years of the very best and maturest years of woman's life which are now practically wasted. Society needs

just that service which mature women can render even if some of them do desire to shirk it.

27. The thing which threatens womanhood is not the ballot, but the factory, the office, the store where men have already permitted her to be driven. If men were supporting women they might have some show of right to deny her the ballot. But when women have to support themselves, even in competition with men, and in thousands of cases help support the men, the denial of the ballot is a stupendous wrong.

28. Much has been said of woman's suffrage in Colorado. Even if it were true that it had accomplished less there than desired it would not follow that it is to blame. Colorado has had more great mining towns than any other state with all the accompanying lawlessness and immorality. While the demand for woman's suffrage in such a state might be more acute than elsewhere, it is evidently no fair test of it.

29. Individuality develops through practice in choosing. If women are mobbish, it is largely for the same reason that monks, soldiers, peasants, and other rigidly regulated types are mobbish. Much of woman's exaggerated impressionability disappears once she enjoys equal access with men to such individualising influence as higher education, self direction, professional pursuits, and participation in political and public life.

30. It is perfectly well known that the liquor traffic and all its supporters and apologists are opposed to woman's suffrage. In the recent campaign for woman's suffrage in Ohio the chief opposition came from the liquor interests who knew that the great majority of women would vote against them if permitted. It is absolutely undeniable that prohibition could not be enforced in Kansas as it is without municipal suffrage for women.

31. If women lose beauty, tenderness, and grace it will not be due to the ballot but to the fact that she is compelled to labor under unwholesome conditions. While men have been denying women a voice in the decisions of society the women have been driven out of their homes to earn their bread. Instead of prating about suffrage taking women away from home, men ought to welcome their assistance in dealing with problems they have failed to solve.

32. But it is argued: "The ballot would not be good for women!" Who is to judge? Where did men get the right to judge? What evidence appears that they are competent? Is it any wonder that women lose patience with such unreasonable,

selfish bigotry and assumption? Some men put up the casuistry that the ballot is a privilege, not a right. Suppose it is. Where do men get the right to withhold it? Are men a privileged class?

33. There have been men who under present conditions have compelled women to slave over the washtub to support children and to furnish liquor and tobacco for the beastly loafers who claim the legal right to lord it over them. These are of them, because these are political questions and politics is infinite wrongs. Greater wrongs are not conceivable. If men cannot redress them why refuse women the right of self defense? The men who are not guilty cannot defend or support those who are.

34. The best and most effective aristocracy, like the best monarchy, suffered from lack of knowledge; they did not know or understand the needs of the people, and they could not find out, for in the last analysis only the man himself, however humble, knows his own condition. It is the same in the case of women. Men as a whole are no more capable of legislating on all matters for women as a whole than a legislature of stockbrokers would be capable of legislating on every matter for farmers.

35. With government and politics touching the women, the home and the children at a hundred new points, and pressing heavily in places which fifty years ago were unaffected by government, many of these aspects of politics are neglected. Men do not concern themselves about the political questions which are of chief importance to the home, because the care of the home is not their business; and women are also negligent of them, because these are political quesions and politics is the business of the men.

36. It is easy to criticise the excesses of the English suffragettes. But any man ought to see that women would not do such things unless they felt themselves very greatly wronged. If women wish to vote that badly, why not let them? What right has man to arrogate to himself the decision of what is best for women? Could anything be more galling to womankind? Why not let them decide for themselves? They certainly are as competent both mentally and morally as men are. Women only ask for liberty; why on earth should she not have it?

37. In the past we have no single instance of any class of men with the ballot legislating fairly for any other class of men

without the ballot. How then can the men of the world all working and all voting protect the special interests of the voteless women of the world who are emerging as workers millions strong on the surface of our human bee-hive? If the vote has been indispensable as a protection in the past, it will be still more indispensable in the future because modern legislation will increasingly control employers and employed.

38. Human nature is conservative, and it is fully as conservative in women as in men. Not one of the many changes in the many things in the status of women would have been made to this day if it had been necessary to wait till the majority of women asked for them. As an example, take the case of the higher education of women. The number of women who wanted that was not so large by a great deal as the number demanding the suffrage. Yet they got what they wanted in spite of the indifference of the majority of women. It will be the same with the question of women suffrage.

39. There are some who say that the exclusion of women from politics is in accordance with the principle of division of labor. This is not the case. The "specialization of industry" has no bearing on the question. Voting is not industry. The progress of civilization has not been to restrict the suffrage more and more narrowly, but to extend it to one class after another. And the best government is found where the largest number of people actively perform their political duties, not where they neglect to vote and leave public affairs to be managed by a small class of "professional politicians."

40. The anxiety that is felt lest women should deteriorate under the corrupting influence of politics would be an honor to humanity were it not for an historical fact that the same sweet solicitude has been put up as a barrier against every progress which women have made ever since civilization began. Prejudices are none the less prejudices because we vaguely call them "nature" and prate about what nature has forbidden when we only mean that the thing we are opposing has not hitherto been done. "Nature" was said to forbid a steamship to cross the Atlantic at the very moment it was crossing, but it arrived just the same.

41. Opponents of woman's suffrage talk as if it involved the whole of woman's relations to man and to the race. It does no such thing. Their objections do not hold against woman's voting but against her changed economic relations. Men are no longer providing homes for women. More than one-fourth

of the women are earning their own living. It is these facts which are attacking the divinest function in human life and women are not to blame for them at all. In comparison with them voting is a mere bagatelle. If women must earn their own living they have a natural right to a vote concerning the conditions under which they work. For men who work beside them to deny them this right seems to some women to be an outrage.

DIGEST OF VARIOUS ARTICLES.—Negative.

1. This much is clear: If women do not vote men should see to it that they are fairly represented, and their wishes respected. This is increasingly done.

2. If women demand the ballot in addition to their present privileges they are not fair to men; if they do not retain their present privileges they are unfair to their children and to the race.

3. Women are now exempt from the army and navy, and are rarely blacksmiths, hod-carriers, section hands, or workers in machine shops, foundries, etc. Absolute equality with men will involve more than many suffragettes desire.

4. The term "Woman's Rights" is question begging. Everybody believes in giving women their rights. We believe in giving dogs their rights; and we are advised to even give the Devil his due. The question is, what is their rights?

5. In all the agitation for woman suffrage it is demanded as an end in itself, and seldom or never as a means to an end. There is practically no discussion of concrete reformations to be accomplished by means of the ballot.

6. Woman's physical handicap puts her to a great disadvantage in competing with men. It is far more reasonable to make the lives of men and women supplementary, cooperative, instead of a competitive struggle where men have the advantage.

7. The only result of suffrage is to double the vote of some families on the same proposition or to foment continual strife and contention, the wife against the husband, the husband against the wife, resulting in divorce and disrupted homes.

8. The chief interest of humanity is its children, the future of the race. Woman's part in this is far greater and more fundamental than man's; her experience with children and the family is far more important to the welfare of the race than men's experience in business.

9. Chief Justice Marshall says: "The granting of the

franchise has always been regarded as an expediency, not as a natural right. It follows, in consequence, that women are compelled to show that a better state of society will follow the granting of the privilege."

10. Women are physically weaker than men. It may be regretted but it is a fact. It may be that the Creator made a mistake, but if so, it is now too late to remedy it. But if women were as rough and clumsy as men it would be hard on babies, to say the least. The existing plan has its advantages.

11. With woman's suffrage, merely voting would not be all. Women would want to hold office, and would have to meet existing competition in getting it. In such efforts women would always have arguments with men which men do not have with women. Why open such a maelstrom of temptation and risk?

12. The almost universal testimony of all modern women who have attained to eminence in statecraft is opposed to Woman Suffrage. Queen Victoria said: "The Queen is most anxious to enlist everyone who can speak or write in checking this mad, wicked folly of Woman's Rights with all its attendant horrors."

13. To give votes to women would be to retard progress rather than to hasten it. Women are naturally far more conservative than men. They are far more subject to the influence of custom and tradition than men are. The fact that a condition exists is for them the very best reason for its continuance.

14. Woman suffrage could not be counted on to hasten needed reforms. In Utah the women have the right to vote, and they use it uniformly in support of the institution of polygamy. And whether they support this institution because of free choice or because they are constrained to this course by their men is immaterial.

15. Very many men would be entirely willing to grant the suffrage to women if they were satisfied that the majority of women wished it. Many women of the highest character and ability protest against the suffrage on the ground that it would be a burden which humanity cannot afford to have them carry.

16. All thinking people agree that the rapid increase in the number of divorces is an evil. The number of divorces in Colorado and in Washington exceeds that of practically every other state, being exceeded only by those states that have a majority of negro population, among whom the marriage tie offers little or no restraining influence.

17. Many women have no opportunity to marry; should their fate be aggravated by refusal of citizenship? Such lives are a tragedy, often, but in the effort to mitigate their lot shall we tempt other women from the highest destiny the world knows? How could it help those who are denied children and home to sacrifice the homes and children of the human race?

18. The strongest refutation of the argument that social improvement will follow this privilege is the experience of those states and nations which now have woman suffrage. In none of them can it be shown that a more desirable condition of society has resulted. Neither can it be shown that the condition of women has been rendered more tolerable.

19. Women now receive deference and courtesy from all normal men. Men lift their hats not to women but to womanhood. Could women expect to retain this deference while engaged in rough and tumble competition with men? And how could men be as able to serve her if he retained the desire to? Could woman hope to gain as much by suffrage as she would lose?

20. The universal testimony of competent observers in those states where women already have the franchise is that women are just as corrupt as men if not more so. They resort to all the corrupt practices in order to win an election. Many women of one party will work for pay to secure the election of candidates of the opposite party, and do this openly.

21. Practically all the clamor for woman suffrage is caused by a very small minority of women. Comparatively few women really want suffrage. They are either indifferent to the proposition or positively opposed to it. There is every reason for believing that if the proposition were placed squarely up to the women alone it would be rejected or else defeated by default.

22. Buying and selling votes is a recognized business in Colorado cities. It is so prevalent that little or no attempt is made to put a stop to it. Not only that, but the women sell their votes cheaper than the men do. Where the prevailing price of votes used to be two dollars, women sell their votes for one dollar, fifty cents, a dress pattern, for even a box of candy.

23. If women were granted the franchise on equal terms with men, the women would become endowed with a tremendous influence without any proportional responsibility for their actions. All writers on the science of politics are agreed that influence without any adequate responsibility for actions conse-

quent on this influence is one of the most pernicious qualities of corrupt government.

24. The real question in woman's suffrage is not what is theoretically right but what is practicable, expedient, wise. We do not live in an ideal world; the worst foe to a good cause is often an impractical, visionary friend. The question is not simple but immensely complicated. That which is best for the race will ultimately be best for women. That cannot be best for women which is injurious to children and to the citizens of the future.

25. To give votes to women would be equivalent to giving an enormous number of votes to clergymen and physicians. Women make up the large proportion of the congregations of the various churches. Most women have implicit confidence in the opinions of their pastors, and are willing to be guided by them in all particulars. Women also make up the great majority of the patients of physicians, on whose judgment they rely.

26. The protection of women at the polls could only be secured by the presence of troops or police for they could not protect themselves and we could not afford to have them try to. But the presence of troops at the polls could never be tolerated for they make free, fair elections impossible. Abuses are inevitable. It is evidently inexpedient for those to go to the polls who cannot protect themselves, especially in lawless communities.

27. Neither men nor women are willing that the race should lose the beauty, tenderness, delicacy, and grace which are now not only the glory of womanhood but of the race. These are most conspicuously the qualities of women which chiefly mark a people as cultivated and differentiate them from savages. It is the lot of women to possess and perpetuate these qualities; certainly mingling in politics will not enhance them.

28. The object of government is to secure justice and the social uplift of the people. These are always the result of an enlightened public opinion and never the result of mere voting. If those women who are devoting so much time and energy to securing the privilege of voting would devote a small fraction of this energy to the cultivation of higher standards among the people a great deal more would be accomplished towards securing the main objects of government.

29. In one respect we might have reason to believe that Colorado should lead all other states,—in laws for the protec-

tion of women and children in industry. Here again is disappointment. In this class of laws Colorado is far behind states in the East, where they have to depend on mere man made laws. There is scarcely a law on the statute books of Colorado for the protection of women and children in industry that was not there before the passage of the Woman Suffrage law.

30. But some women say they do not wish to marry, and that therefore they should be allowed to assume the privileges and prerogatives of men, should be allowed the freedom of action now allowed by society to men. But because they are willing that the race should perish with this generation, should their wishes and desires be granted at the expense of sacrificing the highest interests of the race? Society must order its affairs to suit the normal rather than the abnormal woman.

31. A young man and woman prolonged their engagement until they had more money saved up. The young woman thought to hasten the wedding day by accepting a man's job. That evening the young man vistied his betrothed in gloom and despair. He had lost his job. A woman had offered to take it at a lower salary. When he reached her home he found her jubilant. She had found work. On comparing notes they found that she had taken his job! Would the aggregate tragedy have been any less had she taken some other man's job?

32. All laws rest finally on force. The privilege of the franchise implies the possession of sufficient force to make any law emanating as a result of this privilege effective. Women are confessedly physically unequal to the task of enforcing laws resulting from their use of the franchise. The physical force requisite for the enforcement of such laws must be furnished by men. All privilege implies a quid pro quo. This adequate compensation women are physically unable to furnish.

33. It is argued that because women are morally better than men, therefore they should be allowed to vote. It is not at all clear that women are better than man because they do not vote. Most women live a more or less sheltered life, do not come in contact with the sordid influences inseparable from the task of earning a living. And to the great majortiy of men there is no higher joy then the privilege of laying their lives at the feet of the women they love. The privilege of sheltering and caring for womanhood is the highest glory of manhood.

34. It might be expected that on one question at least women would be unanimous, the securing and enforcement of

wise prohibitory laws. Just the opposite has been the result. In no state where women have the franchise is there a prohibition law although several opportunities have been afforded them to express their desires and wishes. For its size, there is perhaps not a worse governed city in the entire world than Denver. Vice and crime are rampant. Grafters rob the city. The people are at the mercy of corrupt corporations, the law is set at defiance and justice is for sale to the highest bidder.

35. Women are much more easily influenced by superficial considerations than men. In order to defeat a candidate for any prominent place it is only necessary to insinuate some reflection on his character. Insinuations of this type are as potent as sworn testimony. They cannot be traced to their source and their falsehood made manifest. Even if their falsehood were shown no difference would result The result is a lower type of candidates, those who are proof against insinuations of this kind, who do not care what is said of them, knowing full well that the worst that can be said would fall short of the truth.

36. In Denver it is found to be practically impossible to convict women who violate the election laws. The judge who would have the temerity to sentence a woman for such law infraction might as well resign at the end of his term. He would be immediately proscribed, and this sentence would be ascribed to hostility to Woman Suffrage. The consequence is that women of this type vote early and often, in the name of their more stay-at-home sisters. It frequently happens that a woman of the better class, when she comes to vote, finds that someone else has already voted in her name.

37. Even if women were willing to give up all the legal advantages they now possess would it be best for the race? Humanity is tremendously interested in its women, and depends upon them for all its endowment, its power, its progress. We must consider not only the wishes of women but the interests of the race. For every child a woman must have several years of protection; and with all the protection that man and society can give her she still does more than her share. Because a few masculine, mistaken women desire to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage is not a sufficient reason for permitting it, especially when the great majority of women do not wish it.

38. But if all women, good and bad, wise and foolish, availed themselves of the franchise privilege, the results might not be so deplorable. Such is not the case. Most of the best

women, the refined women, those who are happy and contented in their homes, stay at home on election day, while the corrupt, the evil and the foolish come out en masse. The women of the underworld are constrained to come out. They depend for protection upon the police power, who in their turn depend upon the mayor and board of aldermen. The police of each precinct see to it that those who make a business of violating the law come to the polls and vote for the party in power.

39. Women need protection not for their own sake only but for the sake of their children, for the sake of the race. The true man sympathizes with women in the burdens nature lays upon her, and since he cannot share them he gladly shields her, and gladly mitigates with love and service her "sorrow and complaint." There is no need of argument to show the truth of this. The care of children, the conservation of the race, necessitate the home refuge from the world struggle. Coarse men and some suffragettes may sneer at these sentimens, but their realization brings to all not only the highest joy of life but the highest development of the race.

40. Any argument against woman's suffrage based on the alleged inferiority of women is too silly for serious consideration. Any man who uses such argument reads himself out of the ranks of intelligent beings. In several coeducational institutions the boys are trying to get the girls excluded because they take nearly all the prizes,—as at Wesleyan, for example. Such argument is not only ridiculously false but a public injury. The perfectly natural and proper exasperation and resentment which women feel at such argument has played far too large a part in the discussion of woman's suffrage. Many women resent not so much the denial of the ballot as the implied inferiority involved in the denial. Many of the weightiest arguments against woman's suffrage are based on her superiority, organically and morally.

41. Men have no real objection to Woman Suffrage as such. Their objection consists largely in an instinctive fear of the consequences involved therein. There are differences between men and women which are necessary and fundamental and generally desirable. If women are physically weaker than men it only means that hers is the finer and more delicate organization. We do not argue that watches are inferior to brick-bats because we do not throw watches at stray cats. Similarly, the fact that women are incapable of successfully performing much of the world's work is no evidence of inferiority, rather the contrary.

The University Bulletin has been established by the university. The reasons that have led to such a step are: first, to provide a means to set before the people of Oklahoma, from time to time, information about the work of the different departments of the university; and, second, to provide a way for the publishing of departmental reports, papers, theses, and such other matter as the university believes would be helpful to the cause of education in our state. The Bulletin will be sent post free to all who apply for it. The university desires especially to exchange with other schools and colleges for similar publications.

Communications should be addressed:

THE UNIVERSITY BULLETIN
University Hall,
Norman, Oklahoma.

Oklahoma University Press

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 114152793